



THE
"COMPANION TO THE PRAYER BOOK"
DEFENDED

AGAINST THE UNFOUNDED OBJECTIONS OF THE REV. DR. I. W. D. GRAY,
BY REV. F. COSTER,

AND

A REPLY

To the Rev. F. Coster's Defence of the "Companion to the Prayer Book,"

BY REV. I. W. D. GRAY, D. D.

ALSO,

A STATEMENT OF FACTS,

As they occurred at the Annual Meeting of the Diocesan
Church in 1849, with

A REPLY TO SOME MIS-STATEMENTS AND EXPOSITIONS

In the Rev. F. Coster's Defence of the "Companion to the
Prayer Book,

BY DR. BAYARD, M. D., &c.

All of which were published in 1849, and now re-published and

PRINTED BY GEO. W. DAY,

1875.

THE
COMPANION TO THE PRAYER BOOK
DEFENDED
PUBLISHER'S PREFACE.
BY REV. F. COSTER.

In 1849, an effort was secretly made in the City of Saint John, to introduce into the Depositories and Libraries connected with the Episcopalian Denomination. Books belonging to the "Tractarian" School. The movement was discovered, and at once aroused the Evangelical Party. The result was a partial disavowal of the sentiments of the Books by their importers, and the banishment of them from the Parish. It is known to many that a controversy by pamphlet raged not a little fiercely for some time. The defence of the Books was mainly and ably conducted by the late Rev. F. COSTER, then Rector of Carleton; while on the other side were engaged the pens of such a caustic and powerful writer as the late Dr. R. BAYARD, (father of Dr. Bayard still surviving,) and of that fearless, zealous, scholastic, and eloquent champion of the Truth, the Rev. Dr. I. W. D. GRAY, whose death is yet remembered with universal regret, as having produced a loss which has so far been irreparable. It has been noticed, mainly through the instrumentality of Dr. BORSFORD of this City, that the effort to Romanize the Episcopal Church is now repeated in Saint John, by the secret introduction of Books deeply tinged with Sacramentarianism, or openly teaching the Anti-Protestant doctrine of Transubstantiation! It has been thought deeply desirable, therefore, that some information on a subject of the kind should be given forth; and the Publisher believes that great good must be accomplished by reproducing the three principal pamphlets of the former controversy. It will be well for the cause of Truth, if the present discussion shall call to the front any man of the culture, refinement, erudition and power of Dr. GRAY, or at all comparable, for ability, with any who crossed their pens at that time, so memorable in the history of the Episcopalian Church of Saint John, and indeed of New Brunswick. If the re-publication of this former controversy, and the revival of it in its present form, shall secure the removal of Tractarian Books from the stores of Church Depositories, and the shelves of Sunday School Libraries,—whether they be the *learned* (?) volumes of such Ritualists as Sadler, or those Jesuitical books for the scholars, which are poisoning the young by apparently harmless doses of heresy and error, Protestants of all Denominations will have abundant cause to thank God, and take courage,

ST. JOHN, NOVEMBER, 1875.

"THE COMPANION TO THE PRAYER BOOK" DEFENDED

AGAINST THE

UNFOUNDED OBJECTIONS OF THE REV. DR. I. W. D. GRAY,

RECTOR OF TRINITY CHURCH, ST. JOHN,

BY F. COSTER, RECTOR OF ST. GEORGE'S, Carleton, St. John.

WHEN DR. BAYARD made his ill-advised attack upon some of the Books which had been imported for the Diocesan Church Society, at the late Anniversary Meeting of that Society, he called upon the Rev. Dr. I. W. D. GRAY, as his spiritual instructor, to state to the meeting his opinion of one of them, which he then held in his hand, the "Companion to the Prayer-book." In answer to that call Dr. Gray did give his opinion of that work, and as nearly as I can recollect, it was in these words:—"In my opinion the doctrines contained in that book are not in accordance with the doctrines of the Church of England, but are in accordance with those of the Church of Rome." Within the last few days I have been permitted to see and transcribe the five extracts, with his remarks upon them, which Dr. Gray brings forward in support of the charge he thus preferred. As I am the person chiefly reflected upon for the importation of these books (and no one likes to be under the imputation of being the introducer of improper books), I mean in the following pages to show, which I feel confident I shall be able to do to the satisfaction of every candid mind, that the "Companion to the Prayer book" is not fairly obnoxious to the charge of being as to its doctrines, as Dr. Gray says, "*not in accordance with the doctrines of the Church of England, but in accordance with those of the Church of Rome.*" I should, however, observe in the outset, that the words "*of Rome*" should, I think, have been inserted by the author in the first extract, though the sense is sufficiently obvious without them; and that in the fourth of them, the superlative "*the best,*" an unguarded expression as it seems to me, should have been altered by him to the positive "*a good,*" or have been qualified by some such words as "*on of,*" or "*next to confession to God.*"

"The Companion to the Prayer-book" is taken almost word for word from a very celebrated work, the "Rationale of the Book of Common Prayer," by Bishop Sparrow, one of the best Ritualists that the Church of England has produced. He lived during the stormy period of the Great Rebellion, and was expelled from his College at Cambridge, by the Puritans, in 1643, for refusing to subscribe to the Solemn League and Covenant. Soon after the Restoration he was promoted from the Archdeaconry of Sudbury to the See of Exeter, and afterwards translated to that of Norwich. He was deeply read in ritual matters, and compiled a collection of Articles, Injunctions, Canons, &c., which is highly esteemed. I mention these particulars to shew that this excellent little book is not the production of any mean or incompetent person, nor of any one in any way connected with what is called, the modern Romanizing school. Excellent as the work really is, it hardly excites surprise that, as the author was himself persecuted and ejected from his preferments by the Puritans of the 17th century, his book should be assailed and cried down by their successors of the 19th.

That it is of pure Protestant quality, notwithstanding all that is said against it we have abundant evidence at the very commencement of it. The first eight pages are filled with a noble extract from Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity. This is followed by a short HISTORICAL NOTICE, the first sentence of which is in exact accordance with the 21st Arti-

cle; but not by any means in accordance with Roman doctrine. It says, "The Service-books of every Church were originally composed in the language of the people for whose use they were intended." The teaching to be derived from this passage obviously is, that the Service-books ought to be continued in the same language in which they were at first written, that is, in the language of the people who have to use them; or in the words of the Article, that "Public Prayer in the Church should not be in a tongue not understood of the people," which in the Church of Rome it is. Again, in the Preface, p. 21, is another passage which, though in accordance with our 31st Article, is entirely repugnant to the Roman doctrine, against which that Article is a protest, viz., that "in the sacrifice of the Mass the Priest offers Christ for the quick and the dead;" or as the Catechism of Trent expresses it, that "its benefits extend not only to those who communicate, but also to all the faithful whether living or numbered among those who have died in the Lord, but whose sins have not yet been fully expiated." The passage is as follows: "This public service is accepted of God, not only for those who are present and say Amen to it; but for all those that are absent upon just cause, even for all that do not renounce communion with it and the Church: for it is the common service of them all, commanded to be offered up in the name of them all, and agreed to by all of them to be offered up for them all, and therefore is accepted for all them, though presented to God by the Priest alone." Here mention is made of the *present* and the *absent*, but not a word of the *DEAD*! And it will be found that it retains this same Protestant character throughout.

I shall in each case give at full length the passage to which Dr. Gray objects, as he sets it out, word for word, and the remarks he makes upon it; putting in italics those words which he quotes as the words of the author, and leaving those which are his own not so distinguished.

1st. "In a note to p. 87 it is asserted to be the office of the Christian Priest to make an atonement for the people, and that with a view to make the people understand this, the Church orders that when thus making an atonement for them, and offering up for them the passion of Christ, the Priest should say the Prayer secretly, mystically. Surely this teaching is at variance with the doctrines of our Prayer-book, and derogatory to the honor of Christ."

That Dr. Gray mistakes the teaching of this passage is perfectly clear from this simple fact, that his extract, to all appearance, makes the Author of the "Companion" to say that "the Church" of England "orders that the Priest should say the Prayer secretly, mystically;" whereas he actually says in express terms that "this Church" of England "does not order the Priest to say these prayers secretly." I will transcribe the whole note:

"The reason of these *secreta*, secret prayers said by the Priest, may be partly for variety to refresh the people, but, chiefly, as I conceive, that by this course the people might be taught to understand and reverence the office of the Priest, which is to make an atonement for the people, and to present their prayers to God, by that very offering of them, making them more acceptable to God; all of which depends not upon the people's consent or confirmation of his office, but upon God's alone appointment and institution, who hath set him apart to these offices of offering gifts and sacrifices for the people. And therefore as it was appointed by God, that when Aaron by his priestly office was to offer for the people and make an atonement for them, none of the people were to be present; so the Church orders that at some times, when the Priest is making an atonement for the people, and offering up for them and the acceptance of their prayers, the merits and passion of Christ, none should seem actually to assist, but the Priest should say it secretly and mystically. The Church of England is generally in her Common Prayers, as for an humble, so for an audible voice, especially in the Lord's Prayer, appointing it to

"he said, in the Rubric before it, with a loud, that is, an audible voice, not secretly: and this for the more earnest repetition of so Divine words, and to make them more familiar to the people. But though *this Church does not order the Priest to say these prayers secretly*, yet she retains the same order of offering up by the Priest in Collects following the people's foregoing supplications."

The fact is that Dr. Gray passes over the sentence which does relate to the Church of England, because it would not suit his purpose, and applies to her one which relates not to her, but as I conceive to the Church of Rome.

When the Author says that the office of Priest is "*to make an atonement for the people*," he speaks of that office in the general; and in describing the office of the Priest such expressions are very common with our best, soundest, most Protestant divines, as for instance Dr. Thomas Jackson, one of the ablest opponents of Popery the Church of England has produced. He says that "to be a Priest implies as much as to be a *Mediator* or *Intercessor* for averting God's wrath, or an *Advocate* for procuring his favours and blessings." Commentaries. B. 11, c. 2. With respect to the Jewish Priest it is said in Scripture repeatedly, as 1 Chron. vi. 49, "That Aaron and his Sons were appointed to make an *atonement* for Israel." And Hooker says, Book 5, s. 78, "that a Priest is a Clergyman who offereth sacrifice to God. The Fathers of the Church of Christ call usually the ministry of the Gospel Priesthood, in regard of that which the Gospel hath proportionably to ancient sacrifices, namely the Communion of the blessed body and blood of Christ, although it hath properly no sacrifice." The Author says that when the Jewish Priest was to make an atonement for the people, as was appointed by God, none of the people were to be present. And further that in the Church of Rome (for I conceive that the Church of Rome is meant by "*the Church*" in the passage which Dr. Gray quotes, because Wheatley says, p. 155, that "it is a custom there" (in the Romish Church) "for the Priest at all the long Prayers" (the Collects as opposed to the preceding short Versicles) "to kneel before the altar, and mutter them over softly to himself") when the Priest is offering up the passion of Christ, that none should seem actually to assist, the Church orders him to say the prayers secretly, mystically. But when he speaks of the Church of England, not a syllable does he say of making atonement, not a word of offering up the passion of Christ, but simply declares, with a view, to all appearance, to putting a negative on all such conceits, that *this Church does not order the Priest to say these prayers secretly*, though she does retain the order of offering up by the Priest in Collects, following the People's foregoing supplications; "the Minister," as Wheatley says, "collecting into short forms the people's petitions which had before been divided between him and them by Versicles and responses."

Dr. Gray's extracts are very often very unfairly made. Whoever will condescend to quote as unfairly as he habitually does, may find, in any book he lays his hands upon, "teaching at variance with the doctrines of our Prayer-book," and even in Holy Scripture itself, teaching "derogatory to the honor of Christ!"

2nd. "Again, p. 126, two Collects in our Post-Communion service are said to teach that the great benefits of the *Sacrament* are remission of sins, and yet other things, and that not only for those who are present in the body and communicate, but for all the whole Church. Now is this really the doctrine of the Collects? The Catechism of Trent says, 'Such is the efficacy of this sacrifice (the Mass) that its benefits extend not only to the celebrant and communicant, but also to all the faithful whether living or numbered amongst those who have died in the Lord, but whose sins have not yet been fully expiated.' But where in the beautiful language of the Collects in question do we find such a doctrine as this."

In answer to Dr. Gray's first question, I say that in the passage he

quotes from the "Companion," there is not only the doctrine of the Collect, but its very language almost word for word. To shew this, I will place the extract from the "Companion" and one from the Collect in parallel columns—the identity of the language will then be clearly seen.

COMPANION.	COLLECT.
"The great benefits of the Sacrament "are remission of sins, and yet other "things, and that not only for those who "are present in the body and communi- "cate, but for all the whole Church."	"That we and all thy whole Church "may obtain remission of our sins, and "all other benefits of his passion."

This is a satisfactory answer to the first question. Before I can as satisfactorily answer the second, I shall have to transcribe the whole paragraph from which Dr. Gray makes his extract:

"Two Collects follow (whereof the Priest shall select which he pleaseth) full of high and holy doctrine. In the first we acknowledge the great benefits of the Holy Sacrament, viz. remission of sins, and yet other things, and that not only for those who are present in the body and communicate, but for all the whole Church. We pray that hereby we may be fulfilled with God's grace and heavenly benediction, and that our sacrifice, unworthy though we be to offer it, may be accepted for all those purposes for which it was before acknowledged to be efficacious, accompanied as we desire it to be, with the offering of ourselves, our souls and bodies to the service of our gracious God."

Now neither in the extract made by Dr. Gray, nor in the whole paragraph from which he makes it, is there one word about the DEAD, not a word about "the faithful numbered amongst those who have died in the Lord, but whose sins have not yet been expiated"! What then could be Dr. Gray's motive for giving this extract from the Trent Catechism? It is easy to imagine a motive for it, but not easy to express one's thoughts in language which would not be harsh and disagreeable. The doctrine of the Popish Catechism is not to be found in either the Companion or the Collects; and that fact could not have escaped Dr. Gray's observation while engaged in transcribing that part of the Catechism.

3rd. "At page 156, it is said *nothing seems more powerful with God to procure that (a gracious absolution at the day of judgment) than liberality to the poor*. Is this in harmony with our 11th and 12th Articles?"

To shew that this teaching is in harmony with the authorized formularies of the Church, I shall make some extracts from the "HOMILY OF ALMS DEEDS AND MERCIFULNESS TOWARDS THE POOR AND NEEDY." Dr. Gray will recollect that this Homily is in the Second Book: he will also recollect the words of the 35th Article, to which he has repeatedly affixed his subscription—"the Second Book of Homilies doth contain a godly and wholesome doctrine," &c. That godly and wholesome doctrine in this particular is as follows:

"Amongst the manifold duties that Almighty God requireth of his faithful servants the true Christians, by the which he would that both his name should be glorified, and the certainty of their vocation declared, there is none that is either more acceptable unto him, or more profitable for them, than are the works of mercy and piety shewed upon the poor which be afflicted with any kind of misery. —The Holy Scripture in sundry places recordeth, nothing can be more thankfully taken or accepted of God. (Prov. xix. Matt. xxv. Deut. xv.)—The Holy Apostles and Disciples of Christ, who by reason of his daily conversation, saw by his deeds, and heard in his doctrine how much he tendered the poor; the godly Fathers also that were both before and since Christ, endued without doubt with the Holy Ghost and most certainly certified of God's holy will: they both do most earnestly exhort us, and in all their writings almost continually admonish us, that we would remember the poor, and bestow our charitable alms upon them (St. Paul, holy Father Tobit, the learned and godly doctor Chrysostom). As all these (Abraham, holy Fathers Job and Tobit) by their mercifulness and tender compassion, which they shewed to the miserable afflicted members of Christ, in the relieving, helping, and succouring them with their temporal goods in this life, obtained God's favour, and were dear, acceptable and pleasant in his sight; so now they themselves take pleasure in the fruition of God in the pleasant joys of heaven, and are also in God's eternal word set before us, as perfect examples ever before our eyes, both

"how we may please God, in this our mortal life, and also how we may come to live in joy with them in everlasting pleasure and felicity." (This is, I presume, receive a gracious absolution at the day of judgment.) "For most true is that saying which St. Augustine hath, that the giving of alms and relieving of the poor is the right way to heaven. *Via celi pauper est: the poor man, with us, is the way to heaven.* They used in times past to set in the highway sides the picture of Mercury pointing with his finger which was the right way to town. But God's word (as St. Augustine saith) hath set in the way to heaven the poor man and his house, so that whoso will go aright thither, and not turn out of the way, must go by the poor. The poor man is that Mercury that shall set us the ready way: and if we look well to this mark, we shall not wander much out of the right way. For so saith the Wise Man, *he which sheweth mercy to the poor, doth lay his money in bank to the Lord, for a large interest and gain:* this gain being chiefly the possession of the life everlasting, through the merits of our Saviour Jesus Christ." (I presume that none will gain possession of the life everlasting, unless they receive a gracious absolution at the day of judgment.)

Dr. Gray asks whether this teaching is in harmony with our 11th and 12th Articles? I shall leave the Homilist to answer this question, begging Dr. Gray to remember that the learned Bishop Jewel is that person. Mr. LeBas, in his life of that eminent Prelate (published by the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge), tells us, p. 186, that "in 1571 Archbishop Parker felt it expedient to raise, if possible, an effective barrier against the deluge of innovations which Cartwright (the Puritan) was letting loose upon the land. He accordingly submitted the matter to the Bishops assembled in Convocation, and the result of their deliberations was an unanimous resolution that the Articles of 1562" (which Jewel had assisted in revising) "should be printed under the supervision of the Bishop of Salisbury" (Jewel). So that we find the same person, and he well qualified for the task, at once the Author of the Homily, the Reviser of the Articles, and the Supervisor of the printing of them.

"But here," continues the Homily, "some will say unto us, If almsgiving and our charitable works towards the poor be able to wash away sins, to reconcile us to God, to deliver us from the peril of damnation, and make us the sons and heirs of God's kingdom" (in the words of the "Companion," to procure us a gracious absolution at the day of judgment), "then are Christ's merits defaced, and his blood shed in vain; then are we justified by works, and by our deeds may we merit heaven: then do we in vain believe that Christ died to put away our sins, and that he rose for our justification as St. Paul teacheth." All which is the doctrine of the 11th and 12th Articles. He then shows how the doctrines harmonize, and concludes thus: "Alms deeds do wash away our sins" (do procure us a gracious absolution at the day of judgment) "because God doth vouchsafe them to repute us clean and pure, when we do them for his sake, and not because they deserve or merit our purging, or for that they have any such strength and virtue in themselves." Now as the Author of the "Companion" has not asserted any thing like this, his teaching harmonizes with the Homily; and as the Homily harmonizes with the Articles, the teaching of the "Companion" does of course harmonize with the Articles also.

4th. "At page 157. To confess our sins to a Priest even in health is a pious and ancient custom, and not only a sign of repentance, but the best means of obtaining pardon and amending our lives. The Prayer-book recommends in a certain specified case 'opening our grief to a Minister of God's word,' or 'receiving absolution' at his hands with a view to a quiet conscience." But I cannot see that this is identical with saying that the best way to obtain pardon and amendment of life is to confess our sins to a Priest."

I have already said that I look upon "the best" in this passage as an unguarded expression. It would have been well if the Author had left the adjective in the positive state "a good," instead of raising it as he has done to the superlative degree "the best;" or if he had qualified it by the addition of some such words as "one of the best," or "next to confession to God the best." However, Dr. Gray admits that "the Prayer book does recommend in a certain specified case opening our grief to a Minister of God's word, or receiving absolution at his hands with a view to a quiet conscience." The place where these words are to be found is the Exhortation in the Communion Service. But does Dr. Gray mean to say that this is the only place in the Authorized Formularies of the Church in which the subject is mentioned? That there is only one certain specified case in which opening grief to a Minister is recommended by the Church? That there is only one view

with respect to which receiving absolution is recommended by the Church? That there is nothing said in any of the Authorized Formularies expressly about *Confession* to a Priest in health as well as in sickness? nothing about benefits to result from it? nothing about *Absolution* and its benefits? Are the great Church writers when setting forth and expounding her doctrines silent about *Confession* and *Absolution*, and is every thing comprised in that *one certain specified case*? Let us see whether any thing is said on this subject in the Book of Homilies—let us see what *godly and wholesome doctrine* is to be found in the Homily of “*REPENTANCE AND OF TRUE RECONCILIATION WITH GOD.*”

“Now,” says the Homily, “there be four parts of repentance, which being set together may be likened to an easy and short ladder, whereby we may climb from the bottomless pit of perdition, that we cast ourselves into by our daily offences and grievous sins, up to the castle or tower of eternal and endless salvation.”—“The second of them is an unfeigned confession and acknowledging of our sins to God—for without this confession sin is not forgiven. This then is the chiefest and most principal (not the *only*, but the chiefest and most principal) confession that in the Scriptures and word of God we are bidden to make, and without the which we shall never obtain pardon and forgiveness of our sins. Indeed besides this there is another kind of Confession which is *NEEDFUL AND NECESSARY*. And of the same doth Saint James speak after this manner, saying, ‘acknowledge your faults one to another, and pray one for another that ye may be saved.’ As if he should say, ‘open that which grieveth you that remedy may be found.’—He then goes on to show that this text affords no support to the Romanists in their doctrine of *forced auricular sacramental confession*: he says that in alleging this text to support that doctrine, “they are greatly deceived themselves, and do shamefully deceive others.” To this he adds, “being therefore not led with conscience thereof, let us with fear and trembling, and with a true contrite heart, use that kind of Confession that God doth command in his word; and then doubtless, as he is faithful and righteous, he will forgive us our sins and make us clear from all wickedness. I do not say but that, if any do find themselves troubled in conscience they may repair to their learned curate or pastor” (not *one certain specified case only*, but whenever occasion may require), “or to some other godly learned minister, and shew the trouble and doubt of their conscience to them that they may receive at their hand the comfortable salve of God’s word: but it is against the true Christian liberty, that any man should be bound to the numbering of his sins, as it hath been used heretofore in time of blindness and ignorance.”

The Author of the “Companion” says, Confession to a Priest is a *pious custom*. The Homily says, that Confession to God, though the chiefest and most principal confession, is not the only kind of *confession* that in the Scriptures and word of God we are bidden to make: if then, confession to a Priest is bidden us in the Scriptures and word of God, it is a pious custom, being the discharge of a duty which we owe to God.

He says too that it is an *ancient custom*. Hooker, B. 6, p. 3, p. 30, says that the “first and ancientest Father that mentioneth (private) confession (to a Priest) is Origen” (who flourished A. D. 230), “by whom it may seem that men being loath to present rashly themselves and their faults unto the view of the whole Church, thought it best to unfold first their minds to some one special man of the clergy, which might either help them himself, or refer them to a higher court if need were.”—“Men thought it the safest way to disclose their secret faults and to crave imposition of penance from them (the clergy) whom our Lord Jesus Christ hath left in his Church to be spiritual and ghostly physicians, the guides and pastors of redeemed souls, whose office doth not only consist in general persuasions unto amendment of life, but also in private particular cure of diseased minds.”—“The greatest thing which made men willing and forward upon their knees to confess whatever they had committed against God, was their fervent desire to be helped and assisted with the prayers of God’s saints—so that it hath been heretofore the use of penitents to unburden their minds even to private persons and to crave their prayers. But because of all men there is, or should be, none in that respect, more fit for troubled and distressed minds to repair unto than God’s ministers, Gregory, Bishop of Nice.” (who flourished A. D. 370), “proceedeth further—make the Priest, as a father, partaker of thy affliction and grief, be bold to impart unto him the things that are most secret, he will have care both of thy safety and of thy credit.”

He says it is a *sign of repentance*. This may be taken for granted, for very few would confess that of which they did not repent.

He says it is (the best, or as, I think, it would have been better expressed, had he called it a *good* or *one of the best*, or next to Confession to God) *the best means of obtaining pardon*. Hooker says, "In the order which Christian religion hath taught for procurement of God's mercy towards sinners (in other words *pardon*), Confession is acknowledged a principal duty, yea, in some cases confession to man, not to God only." B. 6, v. 3, p. 46.

He says that it is the *best means of amending our lives*. The Homily says that while Confession is the second of the four steps of the short and easy ladder whereby we may climb from perdition to endless salvation—amendment of life is the fourth. "The fourth step is, an amendment of life, or a new life in bringing forth fruits worthy of repentance." Surely the best way to reach the fourth step of a ladder, must be by making use of the lower steps, the second as well as the rest.

Thus is the teaching of the "Companion" in this passage which has been so much talked of, exactly in accordance with that of the Homily and of Hooker; and with the alteration I have suggested perfectly sustainable in every particular.

5th. "At p. 123, it is said *this Sacrament should be received fasting*. *It is to the honour of so high a Sacrament that the precious body of Christ should first enter before any other meat*. Again the words of Cyril, p. 123, *let every one be careful to keep it, for whosoever carelessly loses any part of it, had better lose a part of himself*. Is not the implication in both the passages more in harmony with the Church of Rome than with that of England?"

To make this extract a fair one Dr. Gray should have stated that the first of the two passages are the words not of the Author of the "Companion," but of ST. AUGUSTINE, one of those eminent men whom the Homily styles "godly Fathers endued without doubt with the Holy Ghost," and whom another of them calls "the best learned of all ancient writers." "It is," he says, "true that our Saviour gave it (the Sacrament) to his disciples after supper; but dare any man quarrel with the *Universal Church of Christ* for receiving it fasting. This also pleased the Holy Ghost, that, for the honour of so great a Sacrament, the body of Christ should first enter into the Christian's mouth before all other meats." St. Augustine seems to think, says the Author of the "Companion," that the Catholic Church received this custom of receiving the Sacrament fasting from St. Paul. Hence, perhaps, his saying "it pleased the Holy Ghost."

The other passage he does say are the words of St. Cyril, a Father almost as eminent in his day, as St. Augustine had been thirty years before him. The Homily against "Peril of Idolatry," styles him "Cyrillus, an old and holy doctor." He presided at the General Council at Ephesus, the third of those "six Councils" which were allowed "and received of all men," as the Homily says. However lightly modern Puritans may think and speak of this eminent servant of God, the 165 Bishops assembled at the Second Council of Constantinople, the fifth of the General Councils, esteemed him and his writings so highly, that they anathematized Ibas for writing "an impious Epistle calling the twelve chapters of the Holy Cyril impious and contrary to the right faith;" and among the older Divines of the Church of England his Epistles have been quite as much esteemed as they were by the older fathers. The learned Author of "the Treatise of the Pope's Supremacy" (a work lately published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge), Dr. Barrow, quotes him several times, and each time to establish some important point in opposition to the great Roman doctrine of the Papal Supremacy. For instance to prove—1st. That the sheep whom our Lord bids St. Peter to feed were not, as the Romanists say, his fellow shepherds, but the common believers or people of God; 2nd. That an Apostle, being an Œcumenical Judge, and an Instructor of all the sub-celestial world, was not affixed to any diocese,

and could not be excluded from any, like the Bishop of Rome, or any other Bishop with restraint; 3rd. That both the Scriptures and the Fathers represent the Temporal Sovereign as supreme over his subjects, Clerical as well as Lay, being above all next to God.

With respect to this *fasting*, the Author of the "Companion" does not put it on very high ground, for he calls it only "a circumstance of time," &c. Dr. Gray asks if the implication is not more in harmony with the Church of Rome than with the Church of England! He may perhaps see, as he professed to do in the case of the Post-Communion Collect, something about the DEAD to be implied: but as the mere circumstance of receiving the Sacrament *fasting* is the only implication which the language will justify, that is quite in accordance with the Church of England. In the case of Adult Baptism the Church directs that the candidates are to be exhorted "to prepare themselves with prayers and fasting for the reception of that Holy Sacrament;" surely there cannot be any implication of Popery when an Author recommends as a *circumstance* in the reception of one of the Sacraments, that which the Church enjoins as a *preparation* for the other. And as to theory, the Preface to the Prayer-book declares that at the last review it was made a principle "to reject every alteration proposed, which struck at any laudable practice of the whole Catholic Church." And we have the authority of St. Augustine for saying, that receiving the Lord's Supper *fasting* was the practice of the whole Catholic Church up to his day, which was as early as 396.

The words of St. Cyril stand in connection with the manner in which the bread is to be delivered to the people, that is not according to the practice of the Roman Church into their mouths, but as the Rubric in the Prayer-book directs "*into their hands.*" Companion, p. 122. I can see nothing implied in these words of Cyril beyond *reverence* in handling the symbol of Christ's Blessed Body; that same *reverence* which the Prayer-book inculcates, where the Rubric enjoins the "Minister *reverently* to place upon the Lord's table what remaineth of the consecrated elements, covering the same with a fair linen cloth;" and another that, "he and other of the communicants shall *reverently* eat and drink the same."

By way of conclusion I shall briefly recapitulate what I have written. The first of Dr. Gray's objections rests upon a misapprehension and misquotation on his part of the language of the Author of the "Companion," and falls to the ground as soon as the one is explained and the other exposed. In the second Dr. Gray in effect charges our Post-Communion Collect with teaching that the benefits of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper extend to the DEAD as well as the living, which neither it nor the passage from the "Companion" which he quotes, does in any conceivable way. In the third Dr. Gray in effect charges the Homily of ALMS DEEDS with being not in harmony with the 11th and 12th Articles, which both it, and the passage from the "Companion" which he quotes, strictly are. In the fourth he denies that which the Homily of REPENTANCE and Hooker affirm. And in the fifth he asserts, that a circumstantial recommended by eminent Fathers and practiced by the Universal Church, and said to have originated with St. Paul, is objectionable, which is in direct opposition to a fundamental principle of the English Reformation.

Having thus shown how utterly groundless all of Dr. Gray's five objections really are, the two passages being altered in the way I have suggested, I can safely leave it to the Members of the Church and the Church Society, to decide whether the teaching of this little book is of so objectionable a character as to justify what has been both said and done respecting it; and with the greatest willingness do I leave Dr. Gray in full and unenvied possession of all the satisfaction he may be able to extract from the consciousness, which he must feel, of having been the originator, contriver and manager of a "most distressing discussion," to use the words of a friend of his own; or as it might with great propriety have been called, a most disgraceful row.

Reply

A REPLY
TO REV. F. COSTER'S DEFENCE
TO THE
"COMPANION TO THE PRAYER BOOK."
BY REV. I. W. D. GRAY, D. D., RECTOR OF SAINT JOHN.

~~~~~  
**PREFACE.**

THE REV'D. MR. COSTER has lately circulated throughout my Parish, and for aught I know, through other parts of the Diocese, a printed paper, entitled "The Companion to the Prayer Book defended against the unfounded objections of the Rev. Dr. I. W. D. Gray." The first question that presents itself is, *How did Mr. Coster become possessed of those objections?* This is a point that requires some explanation. By some unusual process, differing certainly from the ordinary routine of conventional practice, a portion of my private correspondence with the Lord Bishop of the Diocese has found its way into Mr. Coster's possession, and has forthwith been made the basis of a personal attack upon me, through the medium of the Press. Had the correspondence been a public one, even in that case, it would have been unfair for a third party to interpose, and throw the weight of his opinions into the scale, until it had reached its termination. But, when private letters, instead of the public Press, had been the channels of communication, and while the interchange of those letters was still pending, for a gentleman, unchallenged, uninvited, unauthorized, as far as it yet appears, to enter the arena, and bringing with him a fragment of the correspondence on one side of the question, to undertake the refutation of it before the public, does certainly, in some measure, set at defiance the courtesies of the social compact. I may be mistaken, but I am under the strong impression that, throughout society, in any of its gradations, a candid and intelligent person could scarcely be found, whose judgment would not pronounce upon such a proceeding the verdict of condemnation.

One simple fact, that shows the impropriety of this course, is, that a few brief quotations in my letter are, without the slightest hint as to the circumstances under which they were made by me, held up to public view as unfair extracts. The correspondence which embodied them arose in consequence of a request, on the part of the Lord Bishop, to be referred to the names of Authors, and to passages in their Works, which had been thought objectionable. In compliance with that request, Books were named, passages referred to, and, where it seemed necessary to point out the particular clauses to which the objections applied, short extracts were given; given, not to the public, to inform them of the contents of Works to which they had not access, but to the Lord Bishop, who had the Works in possession, and consequently the means of examining the entire contents. Was it consonant with the laws of legitimate controversy to take those extracts in their isolated form, unaccompanied by the correspondence that explained them, and hold them up to the public as specimens of unfair quotations? But Mr. Coster has gone further: He has not only condemned prematurely the extracts, as unfair, but undertakes to insinuate that this supposed unfairness was the result of improper motives. To such a charge as this, I can afford to be *silent*. It will not harm the accused: it will not benefit the accuser. It is possible, indeed, that some of my readers, while perusing the following pages, may think,—well, here is indeed a scope for returning the compliment;

but I shall not avail myself of it. The object of my reply is not to impeach Mr. Coster's motives, or to vindicate my own; but to place the truth before my readers in such a form, that they may be guarded against error. While, in aiming at this end, I deem it better not to retort the personalities with which Mr. Coster's paper abounds; in reference to its theology, I shall examine it closely, and use as little ceremony as possible in showing the unsoundness of its principles. Of those principles, as contained in the little work entitled the "Companion to the Prayer Book," which Mr. Coster undertakes to defend, but from which the Bishop of the Diocese has withdrawn his sanction, I certainly did affirm, at the late meeting of the Diocesan Church Society, that they were not in accordance with the doctrines of the Church of England. I affirm it *still*. They are *not* so. They are "strange and erroneous doctrines," opposed alike to the Bible and the Prayer Book—dishonourable to God—injurious to man—and, to the best of my ability, God being my helper, I will endeavor to banish them from my Parish.

---

## REPLY.

MR. COSTER's first argument, in favor of the "Companion to the Prayer Book," is drawn from *external* sources. He says, "It is taken almost word for word from a very celebrated Work, 'The Rationale of the Book of Common Prayer,' by Bishop Sparrow, one of the best Ritualists that the Church of England has produced." And hence, Mr. Coster infers, that "this excellent little book," as he terms it, "is not the production of any mean or incompetent person, nor of any one in any way connected with what is called the modern Romanizing School." Now really this mode of reasoning is too great a demand upon our generosity. While, as yet, we are not in a conceding mood, it supposes us willing to concede *every thing*. First, we are required to grant, without evidence of the fact, that all the extracts in this little Work, are taken from Bishop Sparrow; whereas, in the whole Work, we have but three references to Bishop Sparrow, acknowledged by the Author; and two of these are from his collection of Articles. In all the other instances, we are referred to Councils, as of Carthage, Toledo, Laodicea, &c., or to Fathers, as Irenæus, Tertullian, Chrysostom, Cyril, Augustine, Gregory, &c., without even a hint from the Author that these are Sparrow's authorities. But, suppose all the extracts in this little Compendium to be taken from Bishop Sparrow, the question is, do they fairly represent his opinions? Are they a faithful transcript of the doctrines he means to inculcate in his "Rationale?" In tracing the origin of rites, a learned Ritualist may have quoted from all the Fathers that have ever lived, and all the Councils that have ever sat, in Christendom, ancient or modern, without meaning to adopt, as his own, or inculcate upon his Church, all the sentiments contained in his quotations. Before we can be expected to take these upon his authority, we require to know, distinctly, which he authorizes, and which he does not. And when we know this, Mr. Coster must go a step further, and prove to us, that every sentiment adopted by Bishop Sparrow is a rule for us, now, in the Church of England. This is a concession we are not prepared to make. We know that Bishops and Popes, Churches and General Councils, are all fallible,—that all have erred, and egregiously too. Their opinions and decrees are consequently, no further a rule for us than they accord with our one great standard, the *Holy Scriptures*, and our own Church's exponents of that standard, the *Articles* and *Prayer Book*. A Rationale of the Book of Common Prayer may be instructive as an historical record, and gratifying to the Ecclesiastical Antiquary, but it is no rule for the Church of England upon doctrinal points: and it is easy to see how a little Compendium from such a work, may be constructed for the purpose

of perverting, instead of correcting, the faith of the unwary. If such authority is to be appealed to, let the appeal be a fair one. Let Mr. Coster prove to us satisfactorily, first, that all the extracts in this little work are taken, word for word, from Bishop Sparrow's *Rationale of the Book of Common Prayer*; secondly, that they are *so taken*, and *so combined*, in that Compendium, as to present the genuine sentiments of that author; and thirdly, that there are no tenets expressed or recommended in Bishop Sparrow's work, but what the members of the Church of England are bound to subscribe to. Every one of these positions he ought to substantiate before he can expect us to adopt his conclusion; instead of which, he begins his defence of the book, by presenting us with a "non sequitur" as to its authorship. The extracts, he says, are taken from Bishop Sparrow, therefore the Companion "is not the production of any mean author, or of any one in any way connected with the modern Romanizing school." But who can trace here the connexion between antecedent and consequent? Because Mr. Coster's paper contains extracts from Hooker, does it follow that his paper is not the production of any one connected with the modern Romanizing school? The *remote ancestor* of the "Companion" might have been a good Ritualist; but its *immediate father* a very unsound member of the Church of England, perhaps not a member of it at all. The question is not, whether the extracts are from Bishop Sparrow; but who was the *modern Sparrow*, that picked these feathers from the old Sparrow's nest, and glued them together in their present form? My mind is not prone to suspicion, but I cannot help thinking that he is one of those delicate birds, that have been in the habit of migrating to Rome in the winter season, for a more genial climate. Let, however, this retiring bird, who sits at present in the shades of anonymous obscurity, come forward and show his plumage, and then we will undertake to show, that whether he belongs to the old Romanizing school, or the new one, it matters not, if his work be one of *Romanizing tendency*, which any true Protestant, one would think, might easily discern that it is.

Mr. Coster's next argument is drawn from *internal sources*, from the contents of the book itself. It contains, he says, "a noble extract from Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity." Be it so. There might be fifty extracts from Hooker found in the writings of Roman Catholic authors; but this would hardly prove that their writings are of "pure Protestant quality." It contains also a notice of an historical fact, viz., that the "service books of every Church were originally composed in the language of the people for whose use they were intended." Why, any Roman Catholic acquainted with history will admit this. Harding, for example, the opponent of Jewel, says, "In the time of the primitive church, the people celebrated holy things in the vulgar tongue."—"Tempore Primitivæ Ecclesiæ populus in lingua vulgari sacra celebrabat." Does this prove his writings to have been of "pure Protestant quality?" But Mr. Coster quotes another passage from the "Companion," to prove the purity of its Protestantism, as follows:

"This public service is accepted of God, not only for those who are present and say amen to it, but for all those who are absent upon just cause, even for all that do not renounce communion with it and the Church; for it is the common service of them all, and agreed to by all of them, to be offered up for them all, and therefore is accepted for all them, though presented to God by the Priest alone, as the Lamb offered up to God by the Priest (Exod. 29.) *was the sacrifice of the whole congregation of the children of Israel, a sweet smelling savour, a savour of rest, to pacify Almighty God daily, and to continue his favour to them, and make him dwell with them.*"

This is the *entire* passage. The words in italics were omitted by Mr. Coster, but I have given them as they stand in the "Companion," that, with the full extract before him, the reader may be able to judge of the amount of *Protestantism* which the passage contains. He will find in it a comparison drawn between the office of the *Jewish Priest*, which was to offer a Lamb daily to God for the whole congregation of Israel, "to pacify," says the author of the Companion "Almighty God daily," and



that of the *Christian Priest*, who, in the daily service, according to this writer, makes an offering to God, in his capacity as Priest, for all the Church, whether present or absent. That the implication contained in this passage, as to the power vested in the Christian Priest, to make a propitiatory offering for God's Church, is in harmony with Romanism and at variance with Protestantism, every sound Protestant will admit. He will be able to discriminate between the office of *offering, up prayer for God's church*, in which the whole congregation, no less than the Priest, unites; and the *exclusive power* here claimed for the Priest, of making a propitiatory offering for the Church. In a word, he will perceive that the parallel here attempted to be shown, between the Jewish and the Christian Priest, does not in reality exist; and that Mr. Coster's extract from the "Companion" is a positive proof of the Romanizing tendencies of its author. As to the *negative* proof that Mr. Coster attempts to draw, from the fact that the writer makes "mention of *present and absent*, but says not a word of the *dead*," it is really too feeble to merit a serious reply. His acquaintance with Roman Catholic writers ought to have made him familiar with a multitude of passages in which, even when speaking of the Eucharist (which the author of the Companion is not) the *absent* are named without specifying the *dead*. To give an example, a celebrated Romanist says, "Forasmuch as Christ said to the Apostles, 'do this,' he thereby directed them to do as he himself had done, and therefore since the Eucharist is a propitiatory sacrifice, he thus constituted them Priests, and enjoined them and their successors to offer that sacrifice continually, for themselves and for the sins of others." Now, will Mr. Coster say that the work of this Romanist is of "*pure Protestant quality*," because while he asserts one tenet of his Church, he omits to state another? because while he maintains that the Eucharist is a propitiation for the whole Church, *present and absent*, he does not add for the *dead* likewise?

Such then are the arguments to prove "*the pure Protestantism*" of the "Companion to the Prayer Book." It has extracts said to be from Bishop Sparrow, which are full of Romish doctrines; it has a quotation from Hooker, which any Romish book might have; it acknowledges an historical fact which any well-informed Roman Catholic will do; and contains a passage which implies a doctrine that Roman Catholic writers explicitly maintain!! These, I repeat it, are the arguments put forth, in the exordium of Mr. Coster's defence, to fascinate the minds of Protestants, to produce a favorable impression in regard to this "excellent little book," and render them more charitable to its failings which have subsequently to be explained away. I put it to the common sense and candor of reflecting persons, whether such arguments as these, sought out with diligence by a skillful person and advanced in the fore-front of his defence, are not sufficient of themselves to stamp upon this work the superscription of Romanism?

Mr. Coster next enters formally upon the work of "defence," and takes up seriatim, the objections I have urged against the "Companion," in my private correspondence with the Lord Bishop. His *first* quotation from my letter is as follows:

"In a note to page 87, it is asserted to be the office of the Christian Priest 'to make an atonement for the people,' and that with a view to make the people understand this, the Church orders that 'when thus making an atonement for them, and offering up for them the passion of Christ, the Priest should say the prayers secretly, mystically.' Surely this teaching is at variance with the doctrines of our Prayer Book, and derogatory to the honour of Christ."

Upon this extract Mr. Coster comments as follows:

"That Dr. Gray mistakes the meaning of this passage is perfectly clear from the simple fact, that his extract to all appearance makes the author of the 'Companion,' to say 'that the Church of England orders that the Priest should say the prayers secretly, mystically;' whereas he actually says in express terms that 'this Church of England does not order the Priest to say these prayers secretly.'"

Now let the reader turn to Dr. Gray's extract upon which Mr. Coster comments, and he will see that the words "OF ENGLAND" are added

ed by Mr. Coster himself, not by Dr. Gray. Yet these very words are the point upon which Mr. Coster's objection turns. He himself adds the words that originate the error, and then from his own addition infers that "it is perfectly clear that Dr. Gray is mistaken," whereas, in point of fact, the only thing "perfectly clear" is that Mr. Coster has made a blunder. Mr. Coster proceeds to say—

"I will transcribe the whole note." "The reason of these *secrets*, secret prayers said by the Priest may be partly for variety to refresh the people, but chiefly as I conceive, that by this course, the people might be taught to understand and reverence THE OFFICE OF THE PRIEST, WHICH IS TO MAKE AN ATONEMENT FOR THE PEOPLE, and to present their prayers to God by that very offering of them, making them more acceptable to God; all of which depends not upon the people's consent or confirmation of his office, but upon God's alone appointment and institution, who hath set him apart to these offices of offering gifts and sacrifices for the people. And therefore as it was appointed by God, that when Aaron by his Priestly office was to offer for the people and make an atonement for them, none of the people were to be present; SO THE CHURCH ORDERS THAT AT SOME TIMES, WHEN THE PRIEST IS MAKING AN ATONEMENT FOR THE PEOPLE, and offering up for them and the acceptance of their prayers, the merits and passion of Christ, none should seem actually to assist, but the Priest should say *secretly* mystically. The Church of England is generally in her common prayers as for a humble, so for an audible voice, especially in the Lord's Prayer, appointing it to be said in the Rubric before it, with a loud, that is, an audible voice, not secretly; and this for the more earnest repetition of so divine words, and to make them more familiar to the people. But though *this Church does not order the Priest to say these prayers secretly*, yet she retains the same order of offering up by the Priest in collects following the people's foregoing supplications." "The fact is that Dr. Gray passes over the sentence which does relate to the Church of England, because it would not suit his purpose, and applies to her one which relates not to her, but as "I conceive to the Church of Rome."

In the above note, the words printed in capitals are the clauses referred to in my extract. The *first* clause so printed, expresses the author of the "Companion's" opinion as to the office of a Priest in general; therefore, of course, of his office in the Church of England. Mr. Coster sees this very plainly, and undertakes to vindicate this opinion by the authority of Dr. Thomas Jackson, of Hooker, and of the first Book of Chronicles. I shall give attention to these references presently.

The second clause so printed, Mr. Coster tells us, *relates, as he conceives, to the Church of Rome*. Suppose now we grant this, does it not make the matter worse than before? Are we, in a "Companion to our Prayer Book," to have the Church of Rome represented as "THE CHURCH," and her doctrines brought to bear upon the language of our Liturgy, so as to give it a sense which is really foreign to it? Are we to have, without warning or intimation, her teaching mixed up with that of our own Church, in such a way as to convey her sentiments secretly and mystically to the minds of our people? But, why did it not occur to Mr. Coster, as it did in reference to the term Priest, that when using the terms "THE CHURCH," the writer was referring not to the Church of Rome in particular, or to the Church of England in particular, but to the Church general, or Catholic? If he had carefully read the pages of this little work, the "Companion," which he so highly eulogizes, he would have seen that this is the way the author of it usually refers to the Church Catholic, as distinguished from any particular branch of it. If in doing so he means to identify the Church Catholic and the Church Roman, as Mr. Coster's interpretation implies, then the author of this work is out and out a Romanist; for no man on earth does this but a Romanist. If he means to designate the Church Catholic, as distinguished from the Church Roman, then Mr. Coster is wrong in his interpretation, and after all, the difficulty is not removed, for then we have a writer bringing forward what he regards as the opinions of the Church Catholic to pervert the teaching of the Church of England. Mark how he does this. The Church (i. e. Catholic,) orders the Priests to say these prayers secretly; the Church of England does not: here is her trivial difference. The Church (i. e. Catholic,) recognizes the office of the Priest to offer up an atonement for the people; the Church of England retains "the same order of offering up by the Priest:" here is her essential resemblance. And where does she retain this order? Why in the

prayers which are offered by the Priest alone, after the Litany. He offers them alone; they are "secreta," secret prayers to be said by him alone, to teach the people to reverence his office, which is to make an atonement for them. This, Church of England men, is the teaching you are to receive from the "Companion." Your Prayer Book tells you that "Christ has offered a full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world;" the "Companion" tells you a different story, viz., that your Priests make an atonement for you from time to time, by offering up for you the passion of Christ. Which will you believe? Which will you adhere to; your Prayer Book compiled by the venerable Reformers of your Church, or this anonymous production called the "Companion to the Prayer Book," but which, in my humble opinion, ought to have been styled the "Companion to the Romish Missal?"

But I turn to Mr. Coster's *authorities*. To support the idea that it is the office of the Priest in general to make an atonement for the people, he reasons as follows:

"In describing the office of the Priest such expressions are very common with our best, soundest, most Protestant Divines, as for instance, Dr. Thomas Jackson, one of the ablest opponents of Popery the Church of England has produced. He says that to be a Priest implies as much as to be a *Mediator* or *Intercessor* for averting God's wrath, or an *Advocate* for procuring his favours and blessings—Commentaries B. II. C. 2. With respect to the Jewish Priest it is said in Scripture repeatedly as in 1 Chron. vi. 49, 'that Aaron and his sons were appointed to make an atonement for Israel.' And Hooker says, Book V. S. 78, 'That a Priest is a clergyman who offereth sacrifice to God. The Fathers of the Church of Christ call usually the ministry of the Gospel Priesthood in regard of that which the Gospel hath proportionably to ancient sacrifices, viz., the communion of the blessed body and blood of Christ, although it hath properly no sacrifice.'"

As to Dr. Jackson, when we have the context of the above passage, we shall be able to judge of the value of the extract. At present, suffice it to say, that the language quoted from him is not parallel to that in the "Companion;" and if it were, he is no authority for us any further than his teaching accords with Scripture. As to the reference to Chronicles, where it is said that "Aaron and his sons were appointed to make an atonement for Israel," it is sufficient to say, that we have not Aaron and his sons now. The Levitical priesthood has passed away. The Christian ministry has succeeded. We have no *literal sacrificing Priest* under the Christian dispensation, except that glorious High Priest who sits at the right hand of God. We do not even retain the name of a sacrificing Priest, as applied in its *literal* sense to the Christian minister. Mr. Coster knows full well that the "Hiereus" of the Law is not the "Presbyter" of the Gospel, and that the term *Priest* as the translation of the former, is of different import from the term *Priest* as the contraction of the latter. The Christian Minister, as such, has not the term "Hiereus" applied to him, and for this obvious reason, because he offers no *propitiatory* sacrifice, and by consequence, makes no atonement for sin. He has no power to do so; he has no need to do it; for this work has been done for him, in the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross, done "once for all," fully, effectually, forever. It needs no addition, no repetition, no fresh offering up by Priestly substitution. "Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many." (Heb. 9.) "By one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified." (Heb. 10.) "Their sins and iniquities will I remember no more. Now where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin." (Heb. 10.) Such is the plain teaching of the Divine oracles, and all terms that convey an opposite meaning, or are fairly capable of an opposite construction are to be carefully shunned. The use of inaccurate language leads to the adoption of unsound opinions. Justly has it been remarked by a Dignitary of our Church, that the "incautious, ambiguous, figurative, and illustrative expressions which abound in the works of the Christian Fathers, little versed, in general, in critical accuracy, and, except when contending with Pagan or Heretical opponents, chiefly intent on devotional or pastoral instruction, were easily diverted from their original and sounder meaning, and wrest-

"ed to the countenance and support of the grossest errors and abuses "both of the Eastern and Western Churches." The "Incautious," "ambiguous," "figurative" language of some of the modern Fathers of the 17th century, and of some of their ardent admirers in the 19th, is liable to the same evil.

But Mr. Coster has referred to Hooker, a name justly revered in our Church, and has given, in combination, two brief extracts from his V. Book. Commencing with the *first* of these, I shall give Hooker's words at sufficient length to include them *both*, requesting my readers to note that Mr. Coster's extracts are exhibited by the words in *italics*, and other important clauses by the words in CAPITALS. Remarking upon the distinction between the original and popular meaning of terms, Hooker says—

"If you ask of the common sort what any certain word, for example, *Priest* doth signify, their manner is not to answer, *a Priest is a Clergyman which offereth sacrifice to God*, but they shew some particular person whom they call by that name. And, if we list to descend to grammar, we are told by masters in those schools that the word Priest hath his right place "in him whose mere function or charge is the service of God." Howbeit, because the most eminent part both of Heathenish and Jewish service did consist in sacrifice, when learned men declare what the word Priest doth properly signify according to the mind of the first imposer of that name, their ordinary scholies do well expound it to imply sacrifice. SEEING THEN THAT SACRIFICE IS NOW NO PART OF THE CHURCH MINISTRY how should the name of Priesthood be thereunto rightly applied? Surely even as St. Paul applieth the name of Flesh unto that very substance of fishes which hath a proportionable correspondence to flesh, although it be in nature another thing. Whereupon when philosopher will speak warily, they make a difference between flesh in one sort of living creatures and that other substance in the rest which hath but a kind of analogy to flesh: the Apostle contrariwise having matter of greater importance wherof to speak nameth indifferently both flesh. *The Fathers of the Church of Christ with like security of speech call usually the Ministry of the Gospel Priesthood in regard of that which the Gospel hath proportionable to ancient sacrifices, namely the Communion of the blessed Body and Blood of Christ, although it have properly none no sacrifice.* As for the people when they hear the name it draweth no more their minds to any cogitation of sacrifice, than the name of a senator or of an alderman causeth them to think upon old age, or to imagine that every one so termed must needs be ancient because years were respected in the first nomination of both. Wherefore, to pass by the name, let them use what dialect they will, whether we call it a Priesthood, a Priestership, or a Ministry, it skilleth not: ALTHOUGH IN TRUTH THE WORD PRESBYTER BOTH SEEM MORE FIT, AND IN PROPRIETY OF SPEECH MORE AGREEABLE THAN PRIEST WITH THE DRIFT OF THE WHOLE GOSPEL OF JESUS CHRIST. For what are they that embrace the Gospel but sons of God? What are Churches but his families? Seeing therefore we receive the adoption and state of sons by their ministry whom God hath chosen out for that purpose, seeing also that when we are the sons of God, our continuance is still under their care which were our progenitors, what better title could there be given them than the Reverend name of Presbyters or fatherly guides? THE HOLY GHOST THROUGHOUT THE BODY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT MAKING SO MUCH MENTION OF THEM DOETH NOT ANY WHERE CALL THEM PRIESTS."

This is Hooker's view of the case. The sum of it is, that the term Priest originally signified one who offered sacrifice, though in popular use it is not so understood at present. By *analogy* we may apply it to the ministers of the Gospel, as the Fathers did; but the term "Presbyter" is more proper than "Priest," as sacrifice is now no part of the Church ministry; and hence the Holy Ghost, though making so much mention of Christ's ministers throughout the New Testament doth no where call them Priests. Now it is this passage of Hooker, containing these sentiments, from which Mr. Coster has adduced two short extracts, to prove that the author of the "Companion" is right in saying that it is the office of a Priest to make an atonement for the people, and in assigning this as a reason why certain Collects in our Liturgy are said by the Priest alone. I do not in the slightest degree mean to impeach Mr. Coster's motives, but I would simply ask my readers to consider, whether the next paragraph on Mr. Coster's paper, viz., "Dr. Gray's extracts are often very unfairly made," comes in gracefully or not, at this particular point?

I proceed to Mr. Coster's *second* quotation from my letter.

"2d. Again, p. 123, two Collects in our Post-Communion Service are said to teach that the great benefits of the Sacrament are remission of sins, and yet other things, and that not only for those who are present in the body and communicate, but for all the whole Church. Now is this really the doctrine of the Collects? The Catechism of Trent says, 'Such is the efficacy of this sacrifice (the Mass) that its benefits extend



not only to the celebrant and communicant, but also to all the faithful whether living or numbered amongst those who have died in the Lord, but whose sins have not yet been fully expiated." But where in the beautiful language of the Collects in question, do we find such a doctrine as this?

Such is the quotation. Mr. Coster then proceeds:

"In answer to Dr. Gray's first question, I say that in the passage he quotes from the "Companion," there is not only the doctrine of the Collect, but its very language almost word for word. To show this I will place the extract from the "Companion" and one from the Collect in parallel columns—the identity of the language will then be clearly seen."

COMPANION.  
"The great benefits of the Sacrament are remission of sins and yet other things, and that not only for those who are present in the body and communicate, but for all the whole Church."

COLLECT,  
"That we and all thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of his passion."

After presenting the above parallel, Mr. Coster observes, "this is a satisfactory answer to the first question." How far it is "satisfactory" will be more obvious, when my readers have looked at the *true* parallel, which is as follows:

COMPANION.  
"The great benefits of the Sacrament are remission of sins and yet other things, and that not only for those who are present in the body and communicate, but for all the whole Church."

COLLECT,  
"That by the merits and death of thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in his blood, we and all thy whole Church may obtain remission of sins and all other benefits of his passion."

Let the reader observe, that the words printed in capitals in the above quotation from the Collect, are left out by Mr. Coster in his quotation between the words "that" and "we;" left out without the remotest hint that any thing is omitted. And yet these very words mark one important difference between the "Companion" and the "Collect." The extract from the "Companion" is a *declaration* that we get remission of sins *by the Sacrament*; that from the "Collect" is a *prayer* that *by the merits and death of Jesus Christ, and through faith in his blood*, we may receive remission of our sins. Let the reader mark, and mark well, and bear it in mind when he lays this pamphlet down, that the doctrine of the "Companion" and that of the "Collect" are not, in this instance, the same, but totally different, and that this difference, broad and palpable as it is when they are brought fairly together, is kept out of sight in Mr. Coster's quotation of the Collect, by an elision of the very words that mark the distinction.

And as the above extracts show the *dissimilarity* between the "Collect" and the "Companion," so that from the "Companion" exhibits on the other hand the *similarity* between the doctrine of the "Companion" and the "Catechism of Trent." Let us place these in parallel columns, and then we shall be able to estimate the weight of Mr. Coster's denial of any coincidence between them.

COMPANION.  
The great benefits of the Sacrament are remission of sins and yet other things, and that not only for those who are present in the body and communicate, but for all the whole Church.

TRENT CATECHISM.  
Such is the efficacy of this Sacrifice (the Mass) that the benefits extend not only to the celebrant and communicant, but to all the faithful whether living or numbered amongst those who have died in the Lord, but whose sins have not yet been fully expiated.

Here observe what the "Companion" asserts, viz., that the *benefits of the Sacrament, which are remission of sins and yet other things, extend not only to those who are present and communicate, but to all the whole Church*, and then observe what the Catechism of Trent says, viz., that the *benefits of the Mass extend not only to the celebrant and communicant, but to all the faithful*. Here I think is one coincidence that is tolerably plain. But let us go further—the "Companion" says "not only for those who are present in the body and communicate, but for all the whole Church." Now what is the fair meaning of the expression, "the whole Church," when placed in contrast with those who are present in the body, but the Church, including those in the body and those out of it; in other words, "the faithful, whether living or num-

bered amongst those who have died in the Lord? So that here again, notwithstanding Mr. Coster's disclaimer, there is a very striking coincidence between the "Companion" and the "Catechism of Trent."

The more closely you examine the phraseology of this little work, the more evident does this coincidence become. There are two expressions, in words nearly the same, but in meaning widely different; viz., the expressions "present in body" and "present in the body." The former is employed to signify the being *personally* present in any particular place, as opposed to being there in *mind* or *spirit*; the latter to signify the different condition of the soul, as a *tenant of the body* or in a *disembodied state*. You will find this distinction observed in our English Translation of the Scriptures. Thus, St. Paul speaking of being *personally* present or absent, says, "I verily as absent *in body* but present *in spirit* have judged," &c., (1 Cor. v. 3,) but when referring to the *soul's presence or absence from the body*, he says, "Whilst we are at home *in the body*, we are absent from the Lord;" and again, "We are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent *from the body* and present with the Lord," (2 Cor. v. 6, 8.) So again, (2 Cor. xli. 2,) "Whether *in the body*, I cannot tell," &c. Again, (Heb. xlii. 2,) "As being yourselves *in the body*." Now the author of the "Companion" had his option of these two expressions. Which has he chosen? That which refers to the soul's relative position as to the body. "Not only," he says, "for those who are present *in the body*." In other words, he has chosen that mode which conveys a sentiment in accordance with the Catechism of Trent. True, he does not say in plain terms, as the Catechism does, "*the faithful living or numbered amongst those who have died in the Lord*;" he employs a softer, less intelligible expression, but one which conveys the same idea, and is therefore better calculated to insinuate this pernicious tenet into the minds of Protestants by familiarizing their ears to a phraseology, which as *really* though not so *obviously*, conveys it. Here then let me caution the reader against the attempt to impress the mind with the idea that the Collect and the Companion convey a parallel meaning, because both happen to refer to "the whole Church." In the Collect these words mean the "*whole militant Church*," or as it is expressed in another part of our Communion Service, "*the whole state of Christ's Church militant here on earth*;" but in the "Companion," if we are to construe terms in their ordinary acceptation, they include *the militant Church*, "*and those who have died in the Lord*;" in other words, "*the living and the dead in Christ*."

I trust I have now shown pretty clearly "what Dr. Gray's motive was for giving the extract from the Trent Catechism," and have saved my Reverend Brother the trouble of "imagining one that would not be easy to express in language that would not be harsh or disagreeable."

I proceed to the *third* quotation from my letter:

3rd. "At page 156, it is said, nothing seems more powerful with God to procure that (a gracious absolution at the day of judgment,) than liberality to the poor. Is this in harmony with our 11th and 12th Articles?"

Before I consider Mr. Coster's answer to this question, I shall quote the Articles to which it refers. They are as follows:

Art. 11th. "We are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by faith, and not for our own works or deservings: Wherefore, that we are justified by Faith only is a most wholesome Doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification."

Art. 12th. "Albeit that Good Works, which are the fruits of Faith, and follow after Justification, cannot put away our sins, and endure the severity of God's Judgment: yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and do spring out necessarily of a true and lively Faith; inasmuch that by them a lively Faith may be as evidently known as a tree discerned by the fruit."

The question proposed upon these Articles was this—Is the teaching of the "Companion," that nothing is more powerful with God to procure a gracious absolution at the day of Judgment than liberality to the Poor, in harmony with them? To this Mr. Coster replies:

"To show that this teaching is in harmony with the authorized formularies of the Church, I shall make some extracts from the "HOMILY OF ALMS DEEDS AND MERCIFULNESS TOWARDS THE POOR AND NEEDY." Dr. Gray will recollect that this Homily is in the Second Book: he will also recollect the words of the 35th Article, to which he has repeatedly affixed his subscription,—the second book of Homilies doth contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, &c. That godly and wholesome doctrine, in this particular, is as follows:

Mr. Coster here gives the extract, and then adds:

"Dr. Gray asks whether this teaching is in harmony with our 11th and 12th Articles? I shall leave the Homilist to answer this question, begging Dr. Gray to remember that the learned Bishop Jewel is that person," &c.

But why refer me to the Homilist? Why not answer the question directly? Why turn from the plain unequivocal teaching of the Articles, to a passage in the Homily of Alms deeds? Has Mr. Coster an aversion to the Articles? While he refers to their testimony in favor of the Homilies, does he shrink from the doctrine which they themselves contain? As a Clergyman, is he not pledged on oath to all that the Articles contain, in their plain grammatical sense; while as it regards the Homilies, he is only pledged to the general proposition that "they contain a godly doctrine?" But further, I would ask, if Mr. Coster preferred the Homilies, why not have gone to "the Homily of Justification," which the 11th Art. itself pointed him to, as "more largely expressing its teaching?" Or still further, and this is the more important enquiry, if the Homily of Alms deeds was to be quoted at all, why not have given its full testimony upon the subject in debate? He has taken a long extract from this Homily which refers to sundry passages of Scripture, as Prov. xix., Matt. xxv., Deut. xv., tending to show how highly acceptable to God is mercy to the poor; and also to certain Fathers, as holy Father Tobit, godly Dr. Chrysostom, and St. Augustine, the last of whom compares the poor man to a picture of Mercury on a finger-board pointing the way to Heaven; and this extract Mr. Coster appears to think is a full warrant for the teaching of the "Companion" that "nothing is more powerful with God to procure absolution at the day of judgment than liberality to the poor." But a little farther on, this Homily gives its own interpretation of these strong expressions, and teaches us how to take "a godly doctrine" out of them. Mr. Coster alludes to this passage; gives us the beginning of it, and a clause at the end, but cuts out the middle of it, where this important explication is contained. The passage which has suffered elision is as follows:

"But ye shall understand, dearly beloved, that neither those places of Scripture before alleged, neither the doctrine of the blessed martyr Cyprian, neither any other godly or learned man, when they in extolling the dignity, profit, fruit, and effect of virtuous and liberal alms, do say that it washeth away sins, and bringeth us to the favour of God, do mean, that our work and charitable deed is the original cause of our acceptance before God, or that for the dignity or worthiness thereof our sins be washed away, and we purged and cleansed from all the spots of our iniquity: for that were indeed to deface Christ, and to defraud him of his glory. But they mean this, and this is the understanding of those and such like sayings, that God of his mercy and especial favour towards them, whom he hath appointed to everlasting salvation, hath so offered his grace especially, and they have so received it fruitfully, that although, by reason of their sinful living outwardly, they seemed before to have been the children of wrath and perdition; yet now the spirit of God mightily working in them, unto obedience to God's will and commandments, THEY DECLARE BY THEIR OUTWARD DEEDS AND LIFE, IN THE SHEWING OF MERCY AND CHARITY, (which cannot come but of the Spirit of God, and his special grace,) THAT THEY ARE THE UNDOUBTED CHILDREN OF GOD APPOINTED TO EVERLASTING LIFE. And so, as by their wickedness and ungodly living they shew themselves according to the judgment of men, which follow the outward appearance to be reprobates and castaways; SO NOW BY THEIR OBEDIENCE UNTO GOD'S HOLY WILL, AND BY THEIR MERCIFULNESS AND TENDER PITY, (wherein they show themselves to be like unto God, who is the fountain and spring of all mercy) THEY DECLARE OPENLY AND MANIFESTLY UNTO THE SIGHT OF MEN, THAT THEY ARE THE SONS OF GOD, AND THE ELECT OF HIM UNTO SALVATION. For as the good fruit is not the cause that the tree is good, but the tree must first be good before it can bring forth good fruit; so the good deeds of a man are not the cause that maketh man good, but he is first made good by the spirit and grace of God, that effectually worketh in him, and afterward he bringeth forth good fruits. And then as the good fruit doth argue the soundness of the tree, so BOTH THE GOOD AND MERCIFUL DEED OF THE MAN ARGUE AND CERTAINLY PROVE THE GOODNESS OF HIM THAT DOETH IT, according to Christ's sayings: "Ye shall know them by their fruits." And if any man will object, that evil and naughty men do sometimes by their deeds appear to be very godly and virtuous; I will un-

swer, so doth the crab and chonk-pear seem outwardly to have sometime as fair a red, and as mellow a colour, as the fruit which is good indeed. But he that will bite and take a taste, shall easily judge betwixt the sour bitterness of the one, and the sweet savouriness of the other. And as the true Christian man, in thankfulness of his heart for the redemption of his soul purchased by Christ's death, sheweth kindly by the fruit of his faith his obedience to God; so the other, as a merchant with God, doth all for his own gain, thinking to win heaven by the merit of his work, and so defaceeth and obscureth the price of Christ's blood, who only wrought our purification. The meaning then of these sayings in the Scriptures and other holy writings: "*Alma decida do wash away our sins; and mercy to the poor doth blot out our offences*," is, that we, doing these things according to God's will and our duty, have our sins indeed washed away, and our offences blotted out; NOT FOR THE WORTHINESS OF THEM, BUT BY THE GRACE OF GOD WHICH WORKETH IN ALL, AND THAT FOR THE PROMISE THAT GOD HATH MADE TO THEM THAT ARE OBEDIENT UNTO HIS COMMANDMENT, THAT HE WHICH IS THE TRUTH MIGHT BE JUSTIFIED IN PERFORMING THE TRUTH DUE TO HIS PROMISE."

This is the part which, with a passing notice, Mr. Coster cut out of his quotation. It is one of those fine passages with which the Homilies abound, rich in Scriptural truth, containing indeed "a godly doctrine," beautifully harmonizing with the 11th and 12th Articles above referred to, but, in the same proportion, at variance with the teaching of the "Companion." I have only to add upon this point, that I cannot but heartily join with Mr. Coster in the high eulogium he pronounces upon Bishop Jewel, and rejoice to think that that eminent prelate who was so well qualified for the task, was "at once the author of the Homily, the reviser of the Articles, and the supervisor of the printing of them."

I proceed now to the fourth quotation from my letter :

"4th. At page 157. *To confess our sins to a Priest even in health is a pious and ancient custom, and not only a sign of repentance, but the best means of obtaining pardon and amending our lives.* The Prayer Book recommends, in a certain specified case, "opening our grief to a minister of God's word," or "receiving absolution" at his hands, with a view to "a quiet conscience." But I cannot see that this is identical with saying that the "best way to obtain pardon and amendment of life, is to confess our sins to a Priest."

Upon this passage Mr. Coster's first comment is as follows :

"I have already said that I look upon "the best" in this passage as an unguarded expression. It would have been well if the author had left the adjective in the positive state "a good," instead of raising it as he has done to the superlative degree "the best;" or if he had qualified it by the addition of some such words as "one of the best," or "next to confession to God the best."

Now it must be acknowledged that this is a somewhat novel mode of defending a book against the charge of heterodoxy, and yet I must candidly say, I regard it as the best part of Mr. Coster's defence of the work, for it is nothing more or less than a confession (periphrasis and soothing epithets notwithstanding) that the work itself is, in this particular at least, *indefensible*; that nothing better can be said for it in the way of argument, quotation, or otherwise, than that the author had better have written something else than he has done: in other words, that what he has written contains *false doctrine*. So then after all, "this excellent little book," as Mr. Coster terms it, has to be given up as a false teacher, unless we can change that unfortunate little word "best," into "good," or "one of the best," or "next to confession to God the best!" Alas! we have to deal with the book as it stands; and, as it stands, the word is "*best*," and being "*best*," the doctrine is false. Of what avail then are all appeals to other writings, whether Homilies, Church writers, or Fathers, to prove that it may be useful to open our minds to others, whether Priests or Laymen? This is not the point in debate. The case before us is the assertion in the "Companion" as it stands. Call it "unguarded"—call it "superlative"—call it by whatever name you please, it is false doctrine, and therefore to be rejected by every sound Protestant.

Still, it is worth while to examine, once more, Mr. Coster's quotations. He is really most unfortunate in his selections. It seems as if he had only the alternative of quoting wrong, or quoting against himself. His first appeal is to the "Homily of Repentance," as follows :

"Now, there be four parts of Repentance, which being set together may be likened to an easy and short ladder, whereby we may climb from the bottomless pit of perdition, that we cast ourselves into by our daily offences and grievous sins, up to



the castle or tower of eternal and endless salvation." "The second of them is, an unfeigned confession and acknowledging of our sins to God—for without this confession sin is not forgiven. This then is the chiefest and most principal (not the only, but the chiefest and most principal) confession that in the Scriptures and word of God we are bidden to make, and without the which we shall never obtain pardon and forgiveness of our sins. Indeed besides this there is another kind of confession which is *NEEDFUL AND NECESSARY*. And of the same doth St. James speak after this manner saying, 'acknowledge your faults one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be saved.' As if he should say, open that which grieveth you, that remedy may be found."

Mr. Coster ends with the term "found," but I can assure my readers that there is something *lost*, which I shall presently endeavor to supply. In the mean time, I would just observe that in the above extracts, there is *not one word about confession to a Priest*, nor any allusion to such a custom. There is first, a recognition of *confession to God* as essential to forgiveness; then there is mention of "*another kind of confession which is needful and necessary*." But what is this? You might suppose from the stress laid upon this, by printing the words *needful and necessary* in capitals, that Mr. Coster understood this to refer to *confession to a Priest*; but it has *no such reference*. The Homilist is speaking of the *mutual confession* among Christians to each other, which the Apostle James recommends, and which the Homily immediately proceeds to distinguish, in most emphatic terms, from *confession to a Priest*.

Mr. Coster proceeds:

"He then goes on to shew that this text affords no support to the Romanists in their doctrine of forced auricular sacramental confession: he says, that in alleging this text to support that doctrine, 'they are greatly deceived themselves, and do shamefully deceive others.' To this he adds, 'being therefore not led with conscience thereof, let us with fear and trembling, and with a true contrite heart, use that kind of confession that God doth command in His Word; and then doubtless as he is faithful and righteous, he will forgive us our sins, and make us clear from all wickedness. I do not say but that, if any do find themselves troubled in conscience they may repair to their learned curate or pastor, (not in one certain specified case only, but whenever occasion may require,)' or to some other godly learned minister, and 'shew the trouble and doubt of their conscience to them, that they may receive at their hands the comfortable salve of God's word: but it is against the true Christian liberty, that any man should be bound to the numbering of his sins, as it hath been used heretofore in time of blindness and ignorance.'"

Now what have we here that accords with the doctrine of the "Companion?" Have we any thing about confession to a Priest as a means of pardon, whether "good," "better," or "best?" The utmost the Homily says is comprised in these negative terms, "*I do not say but that, if any do find themselves troubled in conscience, they may repair to their learned curate or pastor, or to some other godly learned minister, and shew the trouble and doubt of their conscience to them, that they may receive at their hands the comfortable salve of God's word.*" which is just the doctrine of the Prayer Book in the certain specified case I had alluded to. But now, recurring to the term "found," which ends one of the above extracts, and glancing onwards to the terms "being therefore not led," &c., which begin another, let us see *what Mr. Coster has left out between them*. The passage, though long, is too important to be lost. Referring to the text of St. James, the Homily proceeds thus:

"And this is commanded both for him that complaineth, and for him that heareth that the one should shew his grief to the other. The true meaning of it is, that faithful ought to acknowledge their offences, whereby some hatred, rancour, rage, or malice, have risen or grown among them one to another, that a brother-reconciliation may be had, without the which, nothing that we do, can be acceptable unto God, as our Saviour Jesus Christ doth witness himself, saying, when thou offerest thine offering at the altar, if thou rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee, leave there thine offering and go and be reconciled; and when thou art reconciled, come and offer thine offering. Matt. v. It may also be thus taken, that we ought to confess our weakness and infirmities one to another, to the end that, knowing each other's frailness, we may the more earnestly pray together unto Almighty God, our heavenly Father, that he will vouchsafe to pardon us our infirmities, for his Son Jesus Christ's sake, and not to impute them unto us, when he shall render to every man according to his works. AND WHEREAS THE ADVERSARIES GO ABOUT TO WREST THIS PLACE, FOR TO MAINTAIN THEIR AURICULAR CONFESSION WITHAL, THEY ARE GREATLY DECEIVED THEMSELVES; AND DO SHAMEFULLY DECEIVE OTHERS: FOR IF THIS TEXT IS TO BE UNDERSTOOD OF AURICULAR CONFESSION, THEN THE PRIENTS ARE AS MUCH BOUND TO CONFESS THEMSELVES UNTO THE LAY PEOPLE AS THE LAY PEOPLE ARE BOUND TO CONFESS THEMSELVES TO THEM.

AND IF TO PRAY IS TO ABSOLVE, THEN THE LAITY BY THIS PLACE HATH AS GREAT AUTHORITY TO ABSOLVE THE PRIESTS, AS THE PRIESTS HAVE TO ABSOLVE THE LAITY. This did Johannes Scotus, otherwise called Duns, well perceive, who upon this place writeth on this manner: "Neither doth it seem unto me that James did give this commandment, or that he did set it forth as being received of Christ. For first and foremost, whence had he authority to bind the whole Church, with that he was only bishop of the Church of Jerusalem? Except thou wilt say that the same church was at the beginning the head church, and consequently that he was the head bishop, which thing the see of Rome will never grant." Johannes Scotus, lib. iv., Sen. Distinct. 17, Quest. 1. The understanding of it then, is as in these words: *Confess your sins one to another*; a persuasion to humility, whereby he willeth us to confess ourselves generally unto our neighbours, that we are sinners, a cording to this saying, "If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." And where that they do allege this saying of our Saviour Jesus Christ unto the leper, to prove auricular confession to stand on God's word, "Go thy way and shew thyself unto the Priest," Matt. viii. Do they not see the leper was cleansed from his leprosy before he was by Christ sent unto the Priest for to shew himself unto him? BY THE SAME REASON WE MUST BE CLEANSED FROM OUR SPIRITUAL LEPROSY, I MEAN OUR SINS MUST BE FORGIVEN US, BEFORE THAT WE COME TO CONFESSION. WHAT NEED WE THEN TO TELL FORTH OUR SINS INTO THE EAR OF THE PRIEST, WITH THAT THEY BE ALREADY TAKEN AWAY? Therefore holy Ambrose, in his second sermon upon the hundred and nineteenth Psalm, doth say full well, "Go shew thyself unto the Priest. Who is the true Priest, but he which is the Priest forever; after the order of Melchisedek?" Whereby this holy Father doth understand, that, both the Priesthood and the law being changed, WE OUGHT TO ACKNOWLEDGE NONE OTHER PRIEST FOR DELIVERANCE FROM OUR SINS, BUT OUR SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST, WHO BRING OUR SOVEREIGN BISHOP, BOTH WITH THE SACRIFICE OF HIS BODY AND BLOOD, OFFERED ONCE FOR EVER UPON THE ALTAR OF THE CROSS, MOST EFFECTUALLY CLEANSSE THE SPIRITUAL LEPROSY, AND WASH AWAY THE SINS OF ALL THOSE THAT WITH TRUE CONFESSION OF THE SAME DO FLEE UNTO HIM. It is most evident and plain, that this auricular confession hath not his warrant of God's word, else it had not been lawful for Nectarius, Bishop of Constantinople, upon a just occasion to have put it down. Nectarius Sozomen Eccles. Hist. lib. vii. cap. 16. For when anything ordained of God is by the lewdness of men abused, the abuse ought to be taken away, and the thing itself suffered to remain. Moreover, *these are St. Augustine's words*: WHAT HAVE I TO DO WITH MEN, THAT THEY SHOULD HEAR MY CONFESSION, AS THOUGH THEY WERE ABLE TO HEAL MY DISEASES? LIB. X. CONFESSIONUM, CAP. 3. A CURIOUS SORT OF MEN TO KNOW ANOTHER MAN'S LIFE, AND SLOTHFUL TO CORRECT ANY AMEND THEIR OWN. WHY DO THEY SEEK TO HEAR OF ME WHAT I AM, WHICH WILL NOT HEAR OF THEM WHAT THEY ARE? AND HOW CAN THEY TELL, WHEN THEY HEAR BY ME OF MYSELF, WHETHER I TELL THE TRUTH OR NOT, SITH NO MORTAL MAN KNOWETH WHAT IS IN MAN, BUT THE SPIRIT OF MAN WHICH IS IN HIM? AUGUSTINE WOULD NOT HAVE WRITTEN THUS, IF AURICULAR CONFESSION HAD BEEN USED IN HIS TIME."

So speaks the Homily in the passage Mr. Coster has omitted. What stronger terms could be employed to denounce the doctrine of the "Companion?" Can Mr. Coster see nothing here but the rejection of the "*sacramental confession of the Romanist*?" Does he not perceive that Augustine and Ambrose gave their decision against it hundreds of years before this sacramental confession was in existence? The latter was first authorized by the 4th Lateran Council, in 1215, whereas the Fathers alluded to lived in the fourth Century, eight hundred years before. The intelligent reader must see that the Homily recognizes as of Divine authority only two kinds of confession, namely, *confession to God, and mutual confession to each other among Christians*; and that as to this *confession to a Priest*, as a necessary thing, or as a means of pardon, it utterly rejects it as contrary to true Christian liberty. Why Mr. Coster should have referred to this Homily, unless it was because it happened to have the word "confession" mentioned in it, I cannot tell; but this I do say, and say with confidence, that had he searched the writings of Cranmer, Latimer, or Ridley, of Luther, Calvin, or Zuingle, or even of the despised "Puritans of the 17th Century," he could not have happened upon one that more fully, forcibly, unequivocally and overpoweringly repudiates the hypothesis which he professes to ground upon it, namely, "*If then confession to a Priest is bidden us in the Scriptures and the Word of God, it is a pious custom, being the discharge of a duty which we owe to God.*"

But I have not yet done with Mr. Coster's quotations. There follow immediately a series of short extracts, selected from sundry pages of the 4th Chapter of the VI. Book of Hooker—five of them from the 7th, and one from the 14th section. The object of these particular sections in Hooker, is to state the views of the Fathers, as well as of the Continental Reformers, upon the subject of Confession; and it is not

a little curious to mark how these little extracts of Mr. Coster are culled from the observations which Hooker makes upon their sundry opinions. The real tendency of these sections is decidedly against the doctrine of the "Companion." In the course of them Hooker discusses the meaning of the texts James v. 14—16, and 1 John i. 9, and proves that they have no reference to confession to a Priest. He shows that Tertullian and Cyprian were no advocates for it. He says :

"I dare boldly affirm, that for many hundred years after Christ, the Fathers held no such opinion; they did not gather by our Saviour's words any such necessity of seeking the Priest's absolution from sin, by secret and (as they now term it,) sacramental confession; public confession they thought necessary by way of discipline, not private confession, as in the nature of a sacrament, necessary."

And after carefully examining the expressed opinions of the early writers, he winds up thus :

"To conclude, we everywhere find the use of confession, especially public, allowed of and commended by the Fathers; but that extreme and rigorous necessity of auricular and private confession, which is at this day so mightily upheld by the Church of Rome we find not. It was not then the faith and doctrine of God's Church, as of the Papacy at this present, 1. That the only remedy for sin after baptism is sacramental penitency, 2. That confession in secret is an essential part thereof, 3. That God himself cannot now forgive sins without the Priest, 4. That because forgiveness at the hands of the Priest must arise from confession in the offender, therefore to confess unto him is a matter of such necessity as being not either in deed, or at least in desire performed, excludeth utterly from all pardon, and must consequently in Scripture be commanded, wheresoever any promise of forgiveness is made. No, no; these opinions have youth in their countenance; antiquity knew them not; it never thought or dreamed of them."

It is to be regretted that Mr. Coster had not given us a better summary of Hooker's reasonings upon this point, even as it regards the opinions of the early Fathers; but more especially, that when he had gone so far as the 14th section of the Chapter from whence his selections are made, he had not advanced one page further, and given what, to us, one would suppose, must be far more interesting, viz., Hooker's views as to the doctrine of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND upon the subject, which are as follow :

"[15.] It standeth with us, in the Church of England, as touching *public* confession, thus :

First. Seeing day by day we in our Church begin our public prayers to Almighty God with public acknowledgment of our sins, in which confession every man prostrate as it were before His glorious Majesty, crieth guilty against himself; and the Minister with one sentence pronounceth universally all clear, whose acknowledgment so made hath proceeded from a true penitent mind; what reason is where every man should not under the general terms of confession represent to himself his own particulars whatsoever, and adjoining thereunto that affection which a contrite spirit worketh, embrace to as full effect the words of Divine grace, as if the same were severally and particularly uttered with the addition of prayers, imposition of hands, or all the ceremonies and solemnities that might be used for the strengthening of men's affiance in God's particular mercy towards them? Such commitments are helps to support our weakness, and NOT CAUSES THAT SEVE TO PROCURE OR PRODUCE HIS GIFTS. If with us there be "truth in the inward parts," as David speaketh, the difference of general and particular forms in confession and absolution is not so material, that any man's safety or ghostly good should depend upon it.

And for *private* confession and absolution it standeth thus with us :

The Minister's power to absolve is publicly taught and professed, the Church not denied to have authority either of abridging or enlarging the use and exercise of that power, upon the people no such necessity imposed of opening their transgressions unto men, as if remission of sins otherwise were impossible; neither any such opinion had of the thing itself, as though it were either unlawful or unprofitable, saving only for these inconveniences, which the world hath by experience observed in it heretofore. And in regard thereof, the Church of England hitherto hath thought it the safer way to refer men's hidden crimes unto God and themselves only; howbeit, not without special caution for the absolution of such as come to the holy sacrament, and for the comfort of such as are ready to depart the world."

Whoever carefully examines this latter paragraph in reference to *private* confession, will perceive that the CHURCH OF ENGLAND, in Hooker's estimation, imposes no necessity upon her people to open their transgressions to men; and while she makes a special provision for the comforts of those who are about to approach the sacrament, or are drawing near to death, by permitting them, at their own earnest request, to have the benefit of absolution and godly counsel, she deems it "the safer way," as her general rule, to refer men's hidden crimes unto

God and themselves only. If any man can see in these sentiments the doctrine of the "Companion," that the "best means of obtaining pardon and amending our lives is to confess our sins to a Priest," all I can say is, that he possesses that species of second sight, which is adapted to the meridian of superstition, but which, by men of science, is rightly considered an evidence of a disordered imagination.

I proceed to the fifth and last quotation from my letter.

"5th. At page 123, it is said, *"this sacrifice should be received fasting."* "It is for the honour of so high a sacrament, that the precious body of Christ should first enter before any other meat." Again, the words of Cyril. p. 12, "*Let every one be careful to keep it, for whosoever carelessly loses any part of it, had better lose a part of himself*." Is not the implication in both these passages, more in harmony with the Church of Rome, than with that of England?"

Upon this quotation Mr. Coster remarks :

"To make this extract a fair one, Dr. Gray should have stated that the first of the two passages are the words, not of the author of the "Companion," but of St. AUGUSTINE."

How such a statement as Mr. Coster here says I ought to have made, could render my extract a "fair one," I do not understand, unless he means it would have furnished him with a fair opportunity of passing encomiums upon St. Augustine, which at present have rather the appearance of being forced into his composition. The first extract I have given, and which states the rule for us in this matter, does not contain the words of St. Augustine, but of the author of the "Companion;" and the second, as it stands in the "Companion," and was quoted therefrom, is strictly the language of the "Companion," though it embodies in an altered form Augustine's words. The whole passage in the "Companion" is as follows :

"This Sacrament should be received fasting. So was the practice of the Universal Church, says St. Augustine, which is authority enough (in things of this nature, namely, circumstances of time, &c.) to satisfy any that do not love contention, 1 Cor. xi. 16. Yet it will not be amiss in a word to show the reasonableness of this Catholic usage. And the first reason may be this: because our minds are clearest, our devotion quickest, and so we fittest to perform this most high service, when we are in our virgin spittle, as Tertullian expresses it. A second is this: it is for the honour of so high a Sacrament, that the precious Body of Christ should first enter into the Christian's mouth before any other meat."

What St. Augustine is here represented as affirming is, that it was the practice of the universal Church to take the Sacrament in this way. The "*quod semper*," however, cannot be designed to be included in this testimony: for it is evident that, "*from the first*," it was not so. If men feel that by going to the Sacrament "*fasting*," they can go in a more elevated frame of devotion, there is nothing in this practice to be condemned: but it is a thing entirely optional. What is to be condemned is, the laying down a rule for the members of the Church of England, that it ought so to be; and when this rule comes to be enforced upon us, by the authority of St. Augustine, while our Prayer Books do not teach it, our Articles enjoin it, or our Homilies inculcate it; and when, above all, we find that at the very first celebration of the Lord's Supper, it was administered to the disciples by the blessed Redeemer, in immediate connexion with a *Feast* instead of a *Fast*, we must be permitted to say, we have a higher rule to guide us than that of the "Companion," or any Saints that lived in the 4th Century.

And when we look at the second reason assigned in the "Companion" for the practice of which Augustine speaks, and which appears to be expressed partly in his own words, namely, that "*it is for the honour of so high a Sacrament that the precious body of Christ should first enter into the Christian's mouth before any other meat*," we are strengthened in our conviction, that all the rules which can be gathered from Councils and Fathers, however venerable the one, or holy the others, are only so far worthy of reception as they are based upon the infallible standard of God's word. We are contented, in this instance, to render precisely the same honour to "*the Sacrament*" which our Divine Master and His disciples did. We wish to descend no lower; we wish to rise no higher; but when we find a book like the "Com-



panion" employing such terms as these, "*it is for the honour of so high a Sacrament that the precious body of Christ should first enter the Christian's mouth before any other meat;*" and when we compare this with another passage on the preceding page, "*It is not man that maketh the body and blood of Christ by consecrating the holy elements, but Christ that was crucified for us;*" we see enough to warn us that we may have safer guides than the "Companion," to teach us the precise degree of honour which we ought to attach to this Sacrament. Mr. Coster attempts to draw a parallel between this language and that of our Church, where she directs the candidates for Baptism to prepare for it with prayer and fasting; but there is no parallel between them. The difference is at once obvious. The one is recommended as a means of humiliation, to assist in acquiring moral qualifications; the other, as an act of homage to the sacramental emblems, which the author, in common with the Church of Rome, appears to regard with superstitious veneration. "We must load the Sacraments," is the well-known maxim of men who belong to the Romanizing school, and he must be wanting in discernment indeed who does not trace the principles of that school in this anonymous production entitled "The Companion to the Prayer Book."

The extract from Cyril is of the same character. "*Let every one be careful to keep it, for whosoever loses any part of it, had better lose a part of himself.*" "*I can see nothing implied in these words,*" says Mr. Coster, "*beyond reverence in handling the symbol of Christ's blessed body.*" Yes, there is more than reverence: there is alarm—there is terror—there is superstition. Tell me that the symbol of my Saviour's blessed body should be handled reverently, and you recall to my mind the sacred object it represents. Tell me that if, inadvertently, I drop a single crumb of it, I incur a penalty worse than having a part of myself excised, and you suggest a totally different train of thought. You lead me to apprehend that it is not bread I am taking into my hands, that it is something else, that some mysterious change had passed upon it; you transfer my reverence from the Archetype to the type; you make it more than reverence; it amounts to superstitious dread; and for this I can find no sanction in my Bible, no countenance in my Prayer Book, and nothing parallel to it in the Rubrics which direct "the minister reverently to place what remaineth of the consecrated elements upon the table, or the people reverently to eat the same." Notwithstanding then that the above extract contains the words of "*Cyril*,"—notwithstanding the Homily styles him "*Cyrillus, an old and holy doctor*,"—notwithstanding the Council at Ephesus anathematized Ibas, for questioning his orthodoxy—notwithstanding the learned author of the "Treatise of the Pope's Supremacy" quotes him several times upon other subjects; yea, notwithstanding Mr. Coster should anathematize, as a race of modern Puritans, all who will not bow to Cyril's infallibility, we must beg to dissent from the sentiment expressed in the above extract, as calculated to mislead the judgment, and convey a false impression in regard to the sacred emblems to which it refers.

What now remains to be considered? Mr. Coster's concluding paragraph.

"Having thus shown how utterly groundless all of Dr. Gray's five objections really are, the two passages being altered in the way I have suggested, I can safely leave it to the members of the Church and the Church Society, to decide whether the teaching of this little book is of so objectionable a character as to justify what has been both said and done respecting it."

My objections, it appears, are utterly groundless! How is this proved? Why, *two passages which I have objected to are to be altered* as Mr. Coster has suggested, the necessity of the alteration proving the groundlessness of my objections! And the other three are to be proved groundless, by misrepresentations of the teaching of the Prayer Book, of Hooker, and the Homilies. And why is this singular process, by a sad misnomer called *proving*, to be resorted to? Because Mr. Coster does not like to labour "under the imputation of being the introducer of improper books." Very natural. Then let him beware

how he incurs it. If he imports such books, and places them, without authority, in the Depositories of the Church Society, he must bear the imputation. He will never escape it by endeavouring to prove that bad books are good ones, that error is truth, that heresy is orthodoxy. This is what Mr. Coster has attempted to do on the present occasion, and of all the documents of a polemical nature that ever met my observation, I never examined one so wanting in sound argument, and accurate quotations as his "Defence of the Companion to the Prayer Book." His motives I touch not. To his own Master he stands or falls. But supposing his intentions right, he displays such a want of acquaintance with the subject in debate, so glaring a misapprehension of the authors he quotes, that in any future publication he may issue, no man ought to feel the slightest reliance upon his statements, until he has had the opportunity of testing their claims, by a careful examination of the authors to which he refers.

It has been my unpleasant task to detect and expose the fallacies of his statements. My aim has been not personal offence to Mr. Coster, but to guard all whom I can influence, against the principles of the books he defends. Those principles I regard as opposed to the teaching of Scripture, contrary to the tenets of our Church, dishonourable to God, and destructive to the souls of men. Viewing them in this light, I have no doubt as to its being my duty, be the consequences what they may, to reject them myself, and to warn others against them—yes, and further still, to prevent as far as my efforts can do it, our Church Society from being made the instrument of disseminating them. It is, I conceive, a deplorable thing to see an Association bearing a title which designates it as a representative of the Church of England in this Colony, disseminating with one hand the doctrines of that Church, and with the other, the tenets of the Church of Rome. It is deplorable, because the two systems cannot both be right. They are upon many essential points diametrically opposed to each other. The Society, therefore, that attempts to propagate them both cannot last long. "A house divided against itself cannot stand;" and, while it lasts, it can do comparatively but little good. "If the trumpet give an uncertain sound who shall prepare himself to the battle?" And why then paralyze the efforts of such a Society, when there is one simple process by which the whole difficulty might be obviated—when there is a venerable Society (the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge,) whose third jubilee we have lately celebrated, which selects under careful revision, books upon every subject connected with religion, and places them in the hands of subscribers in a better form, and at a cheaper rate than any other Society whatever? She speaks *the voice of our Church*. Why not be satisfied with her teaching? If these other publications *differ* from her, are they *right*? If they *accord* with her, are they *necessary*? Are they *so* necessary, that it is worth while to keep the Church Society in constant collision, and hazard its very being, in order to make it the instrument of disseminating them, when every man in the Diocese is at liberty, if he chooses it, to get them through other channels? Men may speak of peace, and profess to love it, but they mistake the road that leads to it, while they pursue this course. They are endeavouring, in a voluntary Association, to compel a large portion of its members to go beyond those common principles upon which all are agreed, and thus to be made the yielding, temporizing, I may say, degraded instruments of disseminating tenets which they abhor. The attempt is a fruitless one. If my efforts, and the efforts of those who think with me can prevent it, it never will succeed: if they fail, we shall retire from the arena, leaving, not willingly, but of necessity, Mr. Coster to enjoy the satisfaction he may be able to extract from the consciousness, that he has broken to pieces a Society, which might have flourished long, and flourishing, diffused on every hand, the blessings of the Gospel of Peace.

NOTE.—The latter clause of Mr. Coster's last paragraph having been placed on its right footing by Dr. Bayard. I think it unnecessary to say a single word in reply to it.

# A STATEMENT OF FACTS

As they occurred at the Annual Meeting of the Diocesan Church Society, (1849)

## WITH A REPLY

To some Mis-statements and Expositions in the Rev. F. Coster's Defence of the "Companion to the Prayer Book."

BY ROBERT BAYARD, M. D., &c.

A few days after the Meeting of the Diocesan Church Society in this City, held on the 18th January last, (1849,) I was called upon by a gentleman from an adjoining Parish, who informed me, that the Lord Bishop of Fredericton "*had withdrawn his approval from the 'COMPANION TO THE PRAYER BOOK,'*" against which objections had been urged by myself and others, and had stated "*that it should not be re-imported.*" I was authorised to give publicity to this statement; and was permitted to see the paragraph declarative of it in a letter from his Lordship. The Lord Bishop in a letter addressed to the Rev. Dr. W. Gray, reiterates this "*disapproval.*" His letter is a reply to one from the Rector of this Parish, written in compliance with the Bishop's request, respecting objectionable Books in the Depository in St. John. These letters have been circulated in this City by his Lordship's friends, prior to the receipt of his Lordship's answer by Dr. Gray, to whom it was addressed. The Rector in his letter made some extracts from the "*Companion to the Prayer Book,*" and the following are his Lordship's remarks in reference to it: "*As I have WITHDRAWN MY APPROBATION, on grounds deemed sufficient by me, I am at a loss to know why you urge the same objections. THE BOOK IS WITHDRAWN. Cadit quæstio.*" The question ceases. Not so with the Rev. Mr. Coster, who, *questionem resurgit*—renews this question.

This assurance induced me to abstain from any further discussion upon the subject, although I felt myself called upon to correct an erroneous impression published in the "*Chronicle,*" and "*Courier,*" namely, that my inquiry ought not to have been made at the Anniversary Meeting of the Society. I think I shall satisfy every unprejudiced reader, that I was perfectly correct as to place, time and circumstance. This morning, I received a communication, entitled "*THE COMPANION TO THE PRAYER BOOK DEFENDED against the unfounded objections of the Rev. Dr. J. W. D. Gray, Rector of Trinity Church, St. John,*" and subscribed by "*F. COSTER, Rector of Saint George's, Carleton, St. John.*" We have here in rapid succession the disapproval of a book by the Right Rev. Lord Bishop of Fredericton, and the approval and defence of the very same book by the Rev. Rector of Carleton, who has by this publication placed his Lordship in an awkward position, irrespective of his disapproval, to which I shall direct the reader's attention in a subsequent part of the following statement, which the Rev. Mr. Coster has elicited.

by asserting, in his *inconsistent defence*, that "Dr. Bayard made his *ill-advised attack* upon some of the books, which had been imported for the Diocesan Church Society."

We are here told that the books were imported for the Society. It will appear hereafter that the Bishop, as Chairman of the Anniversary Meeting of the D. C. Society, stated that the books were not on the shelves of the Depository; and Mr. Coster further stated that he removed them from the shelves, when directed so to do by the Book Committee. If the books were "imported for the D. C. Society," why were they not upon the shelves? And if they were upon the shelves, why were they removed from them? The "*Defence*" has thrown the Lord Bishop and the Secretary upon the horns of a dilemma, and it will require some ingenuity to reconcile the incongruities, and thereby extricate these gentlemen from it. I shall have occasion to advert to this more fully hereafter.

The Rev. Mr. Coster confirms a statement which will be made when I detail the proceedings at the meeting, that the "*Companion to the Prayer Book*" was the book to which the Rev. Dr. Gray and myself directed the attention of the Lord Bishop. I wish the reader to bear this in mind, and contrast it with his Lordship's address to the meeting, and reference to the Chief Justice and William Wright, Esq.

I may venture to assert that the Rector of St. John will expose the weak parts of the *Defence* made by the Rector of Carleton as soon as the correspondence now pending upon the same subject between the Lord Bishop and himself has terminated; which, I presume, will in due time be published, as the circumstances already mentioned now render it obligatory upon the Rev. Dr. Gray to place the *entire* correspondence before the Laity generally for their information. But I cannot refrain from noticing the peculiar way in which the Rector of Carleton endeavors to remove a "superlative" objection. "The *Companion to the Prayer Book*" inculcates, p. 157, "To confess our sins to a Priest even in health is a pious and 'ancient custom, and not only a sign of repentance, but the BEST means of obtaining pardon, and amending our lives.'" The author of the *Defence* says, "The superlative, '*the best*,' an unguarded expression as it seems to me, *should* have been altered by him (the author of the book) to the positive *a good*, or have been '*qualified by some such words as one of, or next to confession to God*.'" We must take the *words* of the "*Companion to the Prayer Book*," as indicative of its doctrines, and not the *words* which the Rev. Mr. Coster would willingly substitute for them, to exonerate it not only from the Bishop's disapproval, but from the "well-founded objections of the Rev. Dr. I. W. D. Gray."

The Rev. Mr. Coster, in page 4 of his *Defence*, confesses that he thinks "*it would have been better expressed had he*," the author of this "excellent little book," *not* used the superlative expression "*best*." By the same parity of argument, any Tractarian may attempt to reconcile the grossest attack upon Protestantism. As for instance, WARD, in his "*IDEAL*," &c., asserts that the Church of England should sue on her knees for re-admission into Rome. Now, to adopt the language of the *Defence*, "I think it would have been better expressed had WARD introduced the monosyllable *not* between the words '*should*' and '*sue*.'" Clarity may put the best construction upon positive expressions, but it has no right to alter, erase or substitute terms. I must therefore protest against this method of defence to substantiate the *ill-advisedness of my attack*. The "*superlative*," in the "*Companion*," places the Defender of it in a superlative difficulty.



In the conclusion of Mr. Coster's defence, he states in the most unqualified manner, that Dr. Gray was the "originator, contriver, and manager of a most distressing discussion—to use the words of "a friend of his own—or as it might, with great propriety, have "been called, a most disgraceful row." I feel myself called upon to refute this unfounded accusation, and I may state most unequivocally and unreservedly, that I had determined to submit the question at the Anniversary Meeting of the Society, in consequence of having been informed by Dr. Botsford that he had purchased the book "The Companion to the Prayer Book," from the Depository; he met me in the street, mentioned the book, and its objectionable character, and I then and there told him I would originate an inquiry respecting it at a full meeting of the Society. Dr. Gray was not aware of my intention, until I consulted him respecting the doctrines of the Book, which was some time after my conversation with Dr. Botsford; to whom I pledged my determination; and I beg leave to assure the Rector of Carleton, that neither the Rev. Dr. Gray nor any other Reverend should have diverted me from my purpose: therefore, "Dr. Bayard" has not been "ill-advised," and he is willing to assume the entire responsibility.

In reference to Mr Coster's remark about the "distressing discussion," I can readily imagine that it did *distress* some persons; and the sequel will prove that the "*disgraceful row*" part of the story, proceeded not from the originator and supporters of the inquiry, but from the opposers of it.

I am aware that some persons will condemn any public exposition of the question at issue, asserting the expedience of privacy in such matters. The Laity throughout the Province are interested in the inquiry, and therefore the objection is untenable, and the adoption of it would do irreparable mischief. Moreover, the Lord Bishop of Fredericton has circulated a letter received by him from the Rev. Dr. Gray, and his Reply to that letter on the subject of these objectionable Books, prior to the receipt of the Reply by the Reverend Gentleman, to whom it was addressed. This transaction,—his Lordship's expressions at the meeting, which I shall quote in their proper place, and the Rev. Mr. Coster's defence of the Book which his Lordship has condemned, and the improper assertions contained in it, call for a public statement of the whole affair.

It is well known that laymen, in different parts of this Province, have complained of the circulation of books containing Tractarian doctrines, which have been purchased from the funds of the D. C. Society.

Non-resistance, and the apathetic cry of "*peace*," favored the diffusion of the Heterodoxy during and for some time after the publication of it in Oxford, until many of our Bishops, Clergymen, and Laity, throughout England, perceiving the dangerous error or their supineness, unitedly opposed the "*innovations*" which, notwithstanding, continue to disturb the peace of the Church in Great Britain; and passing beyond the boundary of their birthplace, have, in their progress, divided our Church in this province. The question of Tractarianism demands public investigation, when the doctrines of the Oxford Tracts are publicly promulgated in books sold at the Depository of a Church Society. Privacy, under such circumstances would be delusive and unsafe: and "*peace*," without inquiry or exposure, would be a compromise of principle. The expressed opinions of some of the highest Dignitaries in our Church warn us against this false security.

It may be asked, why has a layman assumed the responsibility of publishing proceedings which involve doctrinal discussions? I

reply, because a Layman originated the inquiry, in proper time and place, at the Anniversary Meeting of the Diocesan Church Society, and because subsequent transactions have imperatively called for a more public disclosure of facts. I shall detail the proceedings of the Meeting, and ask a few questions arising from them. The doctrinal and theological discussion is assumed by a gentleman fully competent to sustain it, namely, the Rev. Dr. Gray.

The following extracts from the Articles of the Constitution prove undeniably that the Anniversary Meeting of the Society convenes expressly for business purposes. The 4th article designates the officers of the Society, "*who, with the exception of the President and Vice-Presidents, shall be annually elected at the Anniversary Meeting.*" The 13th article provides for the meeting of Parish Committees "*previous to the Anniversary Meeting, WHEN the recommendation to the General Committee of Special Objects shall be determined on.*" The 18th article concludes, that "no article of the Constitution of this Society shall be rescinded, altered, or amended, except with the concurrence of two-thirds of the members present, AT A GENERAL MEETING; and notice of any motion shall be given *at the general meeting* previous to the one at which such motion is to be made." And Mr. Carman's notice, published on the 17th page of the Twelfth, or last year's Report, proves the intention of the Constitution with regard to this meeting for the transaction of business. And I may here remark, that the Lord Bishop assumed a prerogative not given by the Constitution, when he invited, as he did, on the preceding Sunday, non-subscribers to attend this meeting.

I shall refer, in the course of the following statement, to the 8th Article of the Constitution of the Society, and shall therefore transcribe it for the reader's information. It provides "*That the Society will circulate no books, which are not in the catalogue of the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge, except such as the Bishop may approve.*"

The Lord Bishop of Fredericton preached in Trinity Church on the Sunday preceding the Anniversary Meeting. At the time of giving notices, he requested the attendance of the members, and invited all persons friendly to the objects of the Society to attend the meeting. The spacious room was filled at the appointed hour by a most respectable assemblage; and the Lord Bishop was unanimously called to the Chair. He directed the Rector of the Parish to precede the business of the evening with prayer; after this, he addressed the audience upon the objects and success of the Society, and observed "*that this meeting was the largest and most respectable which he had ever attended in the Province.*" After the conclusion of his address, his Lordship, as Chairman, called upon several gentlemen to move some *platform resolutions*, with which they had been previously furnished. When these speeches were ended, the Chairman held up another resolution, remarking at the time, that the names of a mover and seconder were not inscribed upon it, and intimating his wish that some gentleman would take it. The Rev. Dr. Alley immediately complied, and moved that the thanks of the meeting be given to the members of the Executive Committee, and Officers of the Society, and that they be requested to continue in office.

The resolution was opposed by several gentlemen, urging that it should be divided into two distinct resolutions, and that the officers should be individually nominated and elected. This amendment was carried, after a warm discussion, and the election was delayed

for an hour or two. In the mean time I rose, and addressed the Chairman as follows:

"MY LORD,—I beg leave most respectfully to submit to your Lordship's consideration, as the President of the Diocesan Society, and as Chairman of this meeting, and to the particular attention of this large and highly respectable audience, a few observations introductory to a resolution which I intend to bring forward.

"I duly appreciate and respond to your Lordship's expression of hope in your opening address that the proceedings of this meeting should be characterized by conduct worthy of its object, and I beg leave most explicitly to assure your Lordship that I will confine my remarks within the pale of our laws, and of that respect which is due to the exalted offices which your Lordship holds as our Diocesan, and as Chairman of this meeting. And as my resolution will in all probability occasion some collision of opinion, I sincerely hope it will not create any collision of courtesy among gentlemen discussing an important question.

"Mr. Justice Street, in the course of his address, stated that the Diocesan Church Society was deeply rooted in the affections and confidence of the people throughout this Province; and I rejoice at it. But, my Lord, if the tree is so deeply rooted and esteemed, we should be the more watchful, and remove any parasitical sucker that may vitiate its fruit. I hold in my hand a specimen of some books obtained from the Depository of the Society in this City, which, in my humble opinion, are calculated to prejudice the interests of this Society, and the cause of Protestantism in this Province, as they manifest unequivocally some of the distinctive characteristics of practices and doctrines which have been condemned by a large majority of Bishops in England—by a large majority of eminent and talented clergyman—by a large majority of the laity—by the decided stand of the University of Oxford, where these doctrines first appeared in the '*Tracts for the Times*,'—and lastly, and most conclusively, by our Ecclesiastical Courts

"Stimulated, my Lord, by a sense of duty, and encouraged by such high and commanding authority, I unhesitatingly come forward, as a Parent, a Vestryman, and as a Protestant, to resist the first systematic encroachment of Tractarianism in this Parish; and accordingly I beg leave to ask the Chairman of the Book Committee, through your Lordship, whether books, such as I now hold in my hand, the '*Companion to the Prayer Book*,' and '*Office of Chorister*,' were introduced into the Depository, agreeably to the tenor and spirit of the 8th Article of the Constitution; and if not, which I must suppose was the case, by whom, and by what authority they came there? I also beg leave to ask the Chairman in his character as our Rector and Spiritual Instructor, whether these books meet with his approval; and whether he considers their doctrines in conformity with the Church of England?" "I shall pause, my Lord, for a reply."

The Rev. Dr. Gray, the Chairman of the Book Committee, immediately responded, stating that the books to which reference had been made, were not admitted into the Depository with the sanction of the Committee,—that he disapproved of them,—that he considered the "*Office of Chorister*" objectionable, principally for its absurdity, but that the "*Companion to the Prayer Book*" contains doctrines decidedly opposed to those of the Church of England.

I then continued: "My Lord, I came prepared with references to particular passages in the '*Companion to the Prayer Book*,' as illustrations of its objectionable character, but the declaration of our Rector's sentiments supercedes the necessity of reading them,

"as I cannot refer the audience to better evidence; I shall, therefore, conclude my remarks, at present, by moving, 'That a number of books have been placed upon the shelves of the Depository, in this city, without the sanction of the Book Committee, highly objectionable in their doctrines, and calculated to injure the interests of this Society, and of the Church generally.'"

This motion was seconded by Mr. J. Lawrence, who suggested the addition of the following words, "and that they be immediately removed from the Depository," which were accordingly annexed to the original resolution. Mr. Lawrence supported the motion in a comprehensive and appropriate speech.

I subjoin the following observations, made by Mr. Lawrence, to show that the resolution was not brought forward and supported by any language or appeal to the Bishop for his sentiments, authorizing the unguarded expressions, with which his Lordship insulted the mover and supporters of it, and to which I shall direct attention hereafter.

"MY LORD,—It is with deep regret, that, in common with many present, I have heard of the introduction into this Province, and into the Depository of the Society in this city, of a number of books, the tendency of which is to sap the foundation of *Protestantism*, and to weaken our attachment to a *Church*, which has, in the hand of the Almighty, produced many champions for truth, and which has proved herself, the great bulwark of Christianity.

"It must be apparent to every unprejudiced mind, that a great injury has been done to this Society, inasmuch as the fourth section, of the 6th Article of the Constitution, has been violated, for, it expressly states, 'that all books imported, shall be in strict accordance with the principles of the Church of England.' I appeal to you, my Lord, Reverend Gentlemen, and Laity, if I am not correct when I assert, that the book to which the mover of the resolution has referred, and which the Rector of the Parish has condemned, is not in accordance with her principles. Never let us forget, that it was in defence of the pure doctrines of our Church, that the Martyrs bled and died, men whose names shine forth in the great constellation of Christianity, as luminaries to save us, and the generations to come, from shipwreck on those shoals of error in faith and doctrine, from which they were so providentially preserved. To circulate such books, is to do injury to the characters of men, of whom it may be truly said, the world was not worthy. Who then, in this assembly, will not, with me, exclaim, 'from all false doctrine, heresy and schism, Good Lord deliver us!'"

"While the objects contemplated by this Society are varied, such as missionary visits, the founding of divinity scholarships, aid to Sunday and other schools, the building of churches, the importation of books, and assistance to widows and orphans of deceased clergymen; these are but auxiliaries to the accomplishment of one grand object, the spread of the everlasting gospel; a noble work, and worthy of the best energy of the mind. It becomes, then, my Lord, an important question as to the best way of accomplishing this great work. Let the Church answer it, at the ordination of her ministers. The only instrument she places in her hand is the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God, and we believe it to be the experience of the ministry in every age, that just in proportion as they have used that weapon, and that only, has been their success in saving souls. Could we to-night summon before us the general assembly of the church of the first-born, all those who have fought the good fight, and have finished their course,



“they would bear united testimony to the power of the Bible, as the great instrument, in the hand of the Spirit, to subdue the pride of man, to enter the citadel of the human heart, and compel submission to the terms of the gospel; while on the other hand we find that in those countries where the doctrines contained in other books opposed to it, have been preached for ages, the only fruit to be found at the present day, is ‘wrath, anger, malice, and all uncharitableness.’

“Many of the clergy and Laity have read Tractarian books, and have become fascinated with the beauty of their language, with the dignity which they claim for our nature, and at last they have imbibed their sentiments, they have left the church of their fathers, and joined the church of Rome. While we regret the steps they have taken, we cannot but admire the consistency of their conduct; for, after having forsaken her principles, it was but common honesty in them, to cease to minister at her altars, or to retain their membership.

“The tendency of the doctrines contained in such books, are well understood in the mother country, for she who sways the sceptre of the British empire knows well, that the perpetuity of her throne and the peace of her subjects, are endangered by them; for she has rewarded that Prelate who has proved himself the great champion of Protestantism, in opposition to Tractarian writers, with the highest ecclesiastical gift in her power, the See of Canterbury, over which CRANMER once presided.

“Is it not imperative, then, upon every true friend of his Church, whatever his rank or station in society may be, if he wishes to transmit her, in all her *purity, strength and vigour*, to his children’s children, to stop the circulation of every book, which is not in accordance with her principles? And unless that is done, and done to-night, great will be the injury inflicted upon her, and greatly will the progress of this Society be retarded. Let us then as the true friends of the Church, imitate the spirit of the great Apostle when he said, ‘if meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no more while the world standeth;’ and say of such books as have been improperly placed in the Depository, we will remove them at once, and import no more forever.

“My Lord,—I cordially concur in the sentiments advanced by two of the previous speakers, in reference to the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. A century and a half has passed away, since the day of its formation, and from that period to the present, she has been going on from strength to strength; onward and upward has been her course, and on every hand she has scattered the glad tidings of peace; since then nations have arisen, and nations have passed away, but this venerable Institution still exists, possessing all the vigour of youth, with the wisdom of age, and why? because she is built upon the foundation of truth. The highest compliment then, which we can bestow upon her, is to import her books, and her’s only.

“My Lord,—It is a well-known truth, that the earth yieldeth her increase just in proportion to the purity of the seed sown, and the extent of the labour bestowed upon it: And, as in the natural world, so in the moral. If we expect to behold an abundant harvest to the Lord, of the peaceable fruits of righteousness, the true and genuine seed of the Word must be sown, for on that, and that alone, will the blessing of heaven descend. To the accomplishment of this great object we must be united; and to effect and cement that union, we must be true to the principles of this Society; And then, ere long, will the distant forest, on the Sabbath morn,

"echo back the sound of the village bell, inviting the humble woods-man to the Sanctuary, to worship the God of his fathers, in the same matchless liturgy in which they worshipped. Then may we hope to behold the dawn of that day when the 'wilderness shall blossom as the rose,' and the desert become the garden of our God."

This motion was opposed by some of the movers of the platform resolutions, who asserted, that no person could form an opinion upon the doctrines of a book, unless he had read it throughout; and before the question could be submitted to the meeting, with propriety, each member voting upon it, should be thus qualified. The Chairman expressed his entire concurrence with these sentiments, and added, that such discussions would convert the meeting into a debating Theological Society. The excitement increased, and the Lord Bishop, forgetting his duty as Chairman, and supporting the opposers of the resolution, entered with much warmth and impatience into the discussion. He became a determined partizan, and in the course of his address to the audience, he confined his remarks *exclusively* to the "*Office of Chorister*," although repeatedly told by the Rev. Dr. Gray and myself, that we objected to the "*Companion to the Prayer Book*." His Lordship, however, persevered in his adherence to the "*Chorister*," observing, that much had been said about *this* book, but that he himself had not seen anything objectionable in it. He said that he had submitted the book to the judgment of three lay gentlemen, now in the room, well qualified to give an opinion upon the subject, and asking whether he might bring forward their names; and being answered in the affirmative, he mentioned the Chief Justice and William Wright, Esq., who expressed their assent. And here I would direct the attention of the reader to the statement in the Rev. Mr. Cester's "*Defence*," confirmatory of the assertion, that the "*Companion to the Prayer Book*" was the *objectionable work*.

I shall make some extracts from this Book to illustrate its character, and the approval of his Lordship's Referees. The Chairman capped the climax of evasion by assuring the audience in the most unqualified manner, that "*the Books ARE not in the Depository*." This declaration drew forth shouts of apparent triumph from his Lordship's party; as it soon became demonstrable that there was such a party. I immediately told the Chairman that the books *were* in the Depository and were purchased from it, and the Rev. Dr. Gray confirmed this assertion, and said, "My Lord, the books were in the Depository, and were there up to a very recent period." His Lordship asked him with petulance, "Do you call all Mr. Chubb's store the Depository?" "No, my Lord," replied Dr. Gray, "I limit it to the shelves selected and set apart for the purpose, and the objectionable books were within those limits, and others of a similar character were intermingled with the books of the Society." Dr. Botsford also rose and stated, that he felt himself called upon to declare, *as one of the purchasers*, of the books, that he procured them from the shelves confessedly occupied, then and now, by the Depository Committee. The room resounded with plaudits and exclamations of "hear! hear!" in approval of the manly and honest conduct of the Rector and Dr. Botsford. I shall have occasion to refer to this interrogatory of the Lord Bishop in a subsequent part of this Statement of Facts, and therefore wish the reader to bear it in mind. Several gentlemen who opposed the enquiry, observed that people frequently differed in opinion as to questions of doctrine, and advocated the "*Companion to the Prayer Book*" upon this principle. And when his Lordship, in the course of his remarks upon the

subject, stated, that it was his maxim "*to live and let live*," the inference was irresistible, that he entertained similar views; and that the "*except*," in the 8th Article of the Constitution, had rendered the preceding clause of the law a nullity. This maxim will not apply with safety to the question at issue. The recognition of it in the selection of books, for the Depository of the Diocesan Church Society, would lead to Latitudinarianism, which must dismember it. Let us suppose that a NEWMAN, or a WARD, shortly before their departure from our Church, were members of our Society; must we, for their sakes, upon the principle of "*live and let live*," introduce "Ward's Ideal," "et hoc omne genus?" His Lordship's "*maxim*," if adopted, must break down the partition wall of Protestantism; and if he really intended that it should receive the interpretation which *circumstances and association* gave it, in such case, it will be incumbent either to amend the 8th Article of the Constitution, by erasing the *exceptionable* power given to the Bishop, or to effect an improvement in the control and appropriation of the funds, or to dissolve the Society by vote; as I am inclined to believe that an overwhelming majority of its members will not subscribe to his Lordship's accommodating "*maxim*." Let us examine the working of it in the present instance. The Diocesan Church Society professes, among other laudable objects, enumerated in the 6th Article of the Constitution, to aid "Sunday and other Schools, in which "Church principles are taught; and to obtain the supply of books "and tracts, in strict conformity with the principles of the Established Church." Books containing doctrines, which the Rector of the Parish has condemned, are found in the Depository of the Society; these doctrines are said to be adverse to the principles of the Established Church; objections are urged against them at the Anniversary Meeting of the Society; the Lord Bishop presides as Chairman; some gentlemen advocate the books upon the principle that they may accord with the sentiments of other readers: his Lordship does not oppose their proposition, but confirms it with the declaration of his "*maxim*" of "*live and let live*." I shall give extracts from the "*Companion to the Prayer Book*," to illustrate the doctrine, and the reader can draw his own conclusion respecting the safety or danger of this liberalism. I wish him also to contrast the expression of his Lordship's "*maxim*" in the Meeting, with the expression of his disapproval of the book out of it, as stated in the commencement of this exposition. "*Live and let live*" is a charitable maxim; but there are cases to which it ought not to be extended, and I may cite one of them, namely, the introduction of Tractarian books into the Depository of a Protestant Church Society. Let the Tractarian live and enjoy his opinions, but books supporting his peculiar doctrines ought not to form part of a Protestant Library. After several gentlemen, who supported the Bishop's views, had spoken upon the subject, Dr. Botsford rose and endeavoured to obtain permission to read some doctrinal extracts from the "*Companion to the Prayer Book*," but he was interrupted by the opposing party with clamorous cries of "No extracts—read the whole book." Nevertheless he continued firm, and repeatedly tried to read, but was as repeatedly interrupted by uproar, that would have characterized *Pandemonium*; and now commenced the "*disgraceful row*," perpetrated by those who tried to overwhelm Dr. Botsford's voice with the tumult of their throats, assisted by their feet. And, if the Rev. Mr. Coste has a correct recollection of the proceedings of the evening, he must acknowledge the truth of this statement. Dr. Botsford, when he found that he could not obtain a hearing, said, "gentlemen, you are unwilling to hear the extracts, because you

"are ashamed of them,"—he then repeated some from memory, viz: "Confession to Priests," &c. During the noise and interruption, the Chairman of the meeting never attempted to command or enforce order. The conduct of the Bishop and his supporters suggests the question, why were they opposed to the reading of a few extracts? The answer is obvious.

During the discussion his Lordship stated that he must assume part of the responsibility of importing the books, as a list was submitted to him, which he supposed was correct, whereupon the Rev. Mr. Coster, Secretary to the Society, rose and further stated, that he had put the books upon the shelves, and he must confess that he had acted indiscreetly, but that he removed them, as soon as he was directed to do so by the Book Committee. If the preceding words are not identically those of his Lordship and the Rev. Mr. Coster, they are nevertheless, the same in substance. The Lord Bishop here acknowledges that he imported the books; and the accounts in the hand of the present Secretary, will show that his Lordship purchased upwards of seventy pounds worth from *Marsters*, successor to *BUNNS*, and others, in London; the Rev. Mr. Coster acknowledges that they were upon the shelves, and the Book Committee can confirm this statement. What must we then infer from the Bishop's unqualified assertion to the audience, viz, "*The books ARE not on the shelves of the Depository?*" It induced some to suppose that they never had been there. This inference was demonstrated by the plaudits of his party. I must refrain from any comment upon this proceeding, and shall briefly recapitulate the facts of the case, from which the reader must draw his own conclusion. The Rev. Mr. Coster states in his "*Defence*" of his "*excellent little book*," that "the '*Companion to the Prayer Book*,' was imported for the Diocesan Church Society." Dr. Gray asserted that it was on the shelves of the Depository. The Bishop asked if he called *all* of Mr. Chubb's store the Depository. He subsequently assumes part of the responsibility of importing it. Mr. Coster acknowledges that the book with others was upon the shelves. Dr. Botsford declares in the meeting, that he purchased it from these shelves, and the Lord Bishop, without any qualification, or reference to the past, asserts that they, (the books mentioned,) *are* not in the Depository. The question did not rest upon the present tense. I asked, "whether '*books*, such as I now hold in my hand, the '*Companion to the Prayer Book*,' and '*Office of Chorister*,' WERE introduced into the Depository agreeably to the tenor and spirit of the 8th Article of "*the Constitution*." The declaration in the present tense is no reply to the question, or refutation of the assertions that the books had been there. It assumed the character of an evasion, and excited the astonishment of those who knew all the circumstances.

I received the following communication from Dr. Botsford, a member of the Executive Committee, upon the subject of the Books, which I submit to the reader, without note or comment: "At the meeting of the Executive Committee on the day following the Annual Meeting of the Society, a discussion arose respecting the shelves upon which objectionable books *were then* standing. The Rev. Dr. Gray stated that they *were still on the shelves* belonging to the Depository, and that they had been allowed to remain there out of respect to his Lordship, as the Committee had been told by the Rev. Mr. Coster, that the Lord Bishop had placed them there with his own hands. The Bishop, after stating that a list of books had been given to him on his way to England, which he had purchased, said: *I affirm, gentlemen, that I did not place them on the shelves with my own hands*. The Rev. Mr. Coster was silent, and did not deny the statement of either party."



In the course of the evening, Judge Parker came forward, and expressed his sincere regret that there were such objectionable books in the Depository; and he said, that the subject demanded inquiry and explanation, and hoped that his Lordship would promote it.

As his Lordship seemed unwilling to submit my resolution to the meeting, and in consequence of the facts which had been elicited by the discussion, I stepped forward, and addressing the Chairman, said, "My Lord, in consequence of your statement, and the acknowledgement of the Secretary, I withdraw my motion."

Before I proceed further, I must observe, that I did not solicit the Lord Bishop to express *his* sentiments respecting any of the objectionable books, nor upon any other subject. And I may venture to assert the same in behalf of all the gentlemen who spoke in favor of my inquiry. I mention this to repel unjust imputations in which his Lordship indulged when he subsequently addressed the meeting; and it now becomes my painful duty to record expressions and a demonstration of feeling, which proved that he had over-stepped his duty as Chairman, and had forgotten the respect due to his own exalted office, and to the audience, which he grossly and causelessly insulted, and which, in his opening address, he acknowledged to be the "largest and most respectable that he had ever seen in the Province." He said, amongst observations of a similar character, that he had left England, and all that was worth living for, to come to America, but "that he had not come to submit to *Lynch Law*,"—"that he would not be forced to declare his sentiments; but this much he would state, that he abjured Popery as much as any man,"—"that Pope Self-Will was in the room,"—"that he was an Englishman, and had the blood of an Englishman in his veins," and would not submit to a "packed party." His Lordship manifested this feeling throughout his address, in which he made some remarks, reflecting as the Rev. Dr. Gray imagined, upon his conduct, and which drew from him the following reply: "My Lord,—Although I have not, like your Lordship, the honor of having been born in England, still, I have English feelings, and can answer a question in a straightforward manner when it is proposed to me," &c.

I assert, that the Lord Bishop of Fredericton neglected at one time, and exceeded at another, his duty as the Chairman of a Meeting; and I must here refer to his conduct and language, and contrast them with the sentiments and avowals of a noble minded Chairman who presided at an important meeting, where conflicting opinions were advanced and discussed. This excellent chairman in his closing address to the meeting, observes: "In truth, I have been a mere regulator of time, and as it were, a pendulum vibrating between the conflicting parties on the right and left, and the only duty devolving on me seemed to be the care of regulating the vibrations with strict impartiality. Possibly it may be expected that I should now advert to the discussion itself, and attempt to lay before you a summary of the arguments: but this assuredly is no part of my office. I depose the balance before you. Examine the scales yourselves: it is for you, and for the public, and not for me to determine which scale preponderates. Were my private opinions of a ton, or a talent weight, or lighter even than a feather, I should deem myself unworthy of the place I have occupied were I to cast that feather in the scale."

The questions propounded were these: Were the books specified by Dr. Bayard, in the Depository of this city? How came they in it? and by what authority? Did the Rector of this Parish approve of them? These questions did not imply the interference of the Chairman. It implicated the Book Committee and the Secretary.

The Lord Bishop did not regulate "the vibrations of the pendulum

with strict impartiality," He became an excited partizan, asking extra-official questions, insulting one party, eulogizing another, and throwing his opinions into the balance on his *left hand*. I submitted my observations to his Lordship as President of the Society, and Chairman of the meeting, merely as an introduction to the resolution which followed them, and not as an appeal for the expression of his opinions. It was his duty to maintain order, hear the discussions, propose the resolutions, and take the decision of the meeting. I call upon his Lordship to particularize one act, or one expression committed or advanced, either by myself, or by any gentleman supporting my inquiry, sufficient to authorize his imputation that we were the abettors of "Lynch Law." The Laws of the Society had been violated. His Lordship's disapproval of the "Companion to the Prayer Book" proves it. We endeavored to maintain the integrity of them, and I now ask, who has "*Lynched*" them? Who imported the Book, from which his Lordship has withdrawn his approval, and expressed his determination that "*it shall not be re-imported*?" Who placed it upon the shelves of the Depository? and who originated, and who supported the inquiry, which has thus effected the expulsion of it?

I am at a loss to discover a cause for his Lordship's undignified allusion to his "*English blood*," at such a time, in such place, and upon such an occasion,—before a meeting which he acknowledged to be "*most respectable*,"—in a building devoted to the cause of Protestantism, and upon a question and inquiry, which his Lordship, as the head of a Protestant church, should have promoted, and not opposed. Did he really imagine that this declaration of the quality of his blood, would convince the audience of his irresistibility, and prevent any farther discussion upon the subject? If so, he has deceived himself; he has over-rated its importance; and undervalued the feelings of an insulted majority of his hearers in the meeting. And I now respectfully ask his Lordship to adduce proof sufficient to warrant his assertion, that we were "*a packed party*," and the imputation that we attempted to coerce him, by "*Lynch Law*," to declare his sentiments. The Lord Bishop of Fredericton has cautiously avoided any expression of his sentiments respecting Tractarianism. Various circumstances, since his arrival in this Province, have concurred to excite the suspicion that he was not opposed to it; and his conduct on the evening of the 13th January, has not removed them. On the contrary, it has confirmed the impression on the minds of many. It is true, he said in the meeting, that he "*abjured Popery as much as any man*." The authors of the Oxford Tracts do the same, throughout many of their writings, in which they artfully inculcate its doctrines. His Lordship must be aware of the anxiety of his Laity upon this subject; and it is cause of sincere regret that he did not unequivocally avow his sentiments respecting Tractarianism specifically, and thus, quiet apprehension, or confirm the prevailing opinion. This would have been candour. But his Lordship has mistaken his own policy, as well as the "*trenchant*" character of our "*North American wit*," which (in his Tour through the Province) "*he laments to say, is too sharp for the spiritual laborer*;" and which I rejoice to say is not so dull as to be easily acted upon by the Tractarian innovator. I ask his Lordship was his language, which I have already quoted, the language of piety, the language of a Prelate, claiming Apostolic descent, the language of a Bishop who felt any wish to conciliate the respect and affection of the people? He spoke truly when he said that "*Pope Self-will was in the room*," and the audience could easily distinguish his Chair and prominent position, and his *imaginary infallibility*, when he endeavored to force the continuance of a gentleman in

office, without any appeal to the opinion and wishes of the members who were the constituted persons to elect him.

The following extracts from the "Companion to the Prayer Book," printed by J. Burns & Marsters, London, will enable those who have not seen the book, to form a tolerably correct opinion concerning it."

*Definition of a Church.*—Page 75.

"In accordance with St. Cyprian, the church is in the Bishop, and the Bishop in the church, and they that are not with the Bishop, are not in the church."

If this is an Ecclesiastical Canon, "*the restless and mischievous Tenant of the See of Exeter*," must have a host of excommunicated persons "*not with*" this arch-Tractarian.

*Secret and Mystical Prayers.*—Page 87.

"The reason of these *Secreta*, secret prayers said by the Priest, may be partly for variety to refresh the people; but chiefly, as I conceive, that by this course, the people might be taught to understand and reverence the office of Priest, which is to make an atonement for the people, and to present their prayers to God by that very offering of them up, making them more acceptable to God, all which depends not upon the people's consent, or confirmation of his office, but upon God's alone appointment and institution who hath set him apart to these offices of offering gifts and sacrifices for the people; and therefore, as it was appointed by God, that when Aaron, by his priestly office, was to offer for the people, and make atonement for them, none of the people were to be present. So the Church orders that at some times, when the Priest is making atonement for the people, and offering for them, and the acceptance of our prayers, the merits and passion of Christ, none should seem actually to assist, but the Priest should say it (*in*us) secretly and mystically."

The author of the "Companion to the Prayer Book," wherever he may be, either in England or New Brunswick, carries the ceremonies of our church back to Mosaic customs.

*The Sacrament.*—Page 122, &c.

"It is not man that makes the Body and Blood of Christ by consecrating the holy elements, but Christ that was crucified for us." After quoting St. Cyril about the danger of losing any of the elements, the author continues: "It is to be given to the people kneeling, for a sin it is *not to adore* when we receive this Sacrament, and the old custom was to receive it after the manner of adoration. This Sacrament should be received *fasting*, because our minds are clearest, our devotion quickest, and so are we fittest to perform this most high service, when we are in our *virgin spittle*, as Tertullian express it. It is for the honor of so high a Sacrament that the precious Body of Christ should first enter the Christian's mouth, before any other meat.

Our Saviour gave no such command when he gave the Tokens of his Death to his Disciples AFTER they had eaten the Passover.

*Baptism.*—Page 135.

"Further, it is worth the while to explain to you why you stand to the West when you say this: (namely, renouncing the Devil,) The sun-set is the place of darkness, and the Devil is the Prince of Darkness. and, therefore, in token of this, ye renounce the Prince of Darkness looking to the West. When you have renounced the Devil, then the Paradise of God is opened to you, which was planted in the East; and therefore, as a type of this, you are turned from the West to the East, the region of light."

*Visitation of the Sick.*—Page 157.

"The minister may not forget to move the sick person, and that most earnestly, to liberality towards the poor: Then we are giving up our account to God; and therefore, then most necessary is it to do the best we can to obtain a gracious absolution at the Day of Judgment: Now, *nothing seems more powerful with God* to procure that than liberality to the poor."

The author of the "Companion" seems to have forgotten "Though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing." This Scripture does not suit a Tractarian translator, who thinks that "*there is nothing more powerful*" than money, to purchase absolution. The rich, in this case, have a decided advantage over the poor man.

*Confession to Priests.*—Page 157.

"Lastly, the Priest must advise the sick man to confess those sins which do most trouble his conscience. *To confess our sins to a Priest, even in health*, is a pious and ancient custom, and not only a sign of repentance, but the *BEST means of obtaining pardon*, and for amending our lives, and is but too "much neglected." See the Rev. F. Coster's easy way of overcoming doctrinal difficulties of a *superlative* character, in his "Defence."

*The Ordinal.*

"The Priest's power to forgive sins is to be exercised in a three-fold manner. 1. In the Sacrament of Holy Baptism, which is ordained for the remission of sins. 2. In the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, and 3. Generally in the Rite of Absolution."

I must refer all who feel interested in the Theological discussion of these several extracts, to the correspondences of the Rev. Dr. Gray, with the Lord Bishop and the Rev. F. Coster, which will doubtlessly be published.

## EXTRACTS FROM THE "OFFICE OF CHORISTER."

Page 35.—"It will not be irrelevant to give some account of the interesting ceremony of the Boy Bishop."

I may here briefly state, that a boy was chosen from the band of Choristers, who was installed as Boy Bishop; preached a sermon; was robed pontifically; had all the honors of office paid to him, and if he died during tenure of office he was laid out in state with all his robes upon him.

Page 58.—"We have little disposition to comment on the expediency and propriety of the custom here described, one thing only we would fearlessly assert, viz., that there is no sufficient ground for the commonly received opinion of its absurdity and profanity. If it had been absurd, it would hardly have prevailed simultaneously in France, Germany, Switzerland, Spain, and every Diocese in England. If it had been profane, *Queen Mary* would not have revived it after *Henry the Eighth* had suppressed it; nor would Dean Calet have ordered the boys of his school at St. Paul's every Childermas day, to come to St. Paul's Church, and hear the Child Bishop's sermon, and after that be at the *High Mass*, and each of them offer one penny to the Child Bishop."

The two following extracts show the dignity of the office:—

Page 61-2.—"Nor was their dress the only thing which marked the Choristers, as set apart from, and *superior* to other lay members of the congregation. The painting in St. Nicholas' Church, Ghent, already mentioned, represents them with the *Tonsure*, the use of which, both in the ordination of Ecclesiastical persons, and the investiture of Knights, betokened a special and permanent conse-



"eration to God's service. The ancient statutes of Exeter cathedral require that the Chorister should receive the T<sup>h</sup> treasure."

Page 63.—A Bishop having enjoined the propriety of catechising the Choristers three times a year.—

"How far the spirit of this has been disregarded may be inferred from the fact, that within the past year, the schoolmaster of one of our Choirs on commencing his task of catechising the Choristers, discovered that one of those on whom he was striving to impress the responsibility of a *child of God*, was actually *unbaptised*, and had served as a *minister* of the church, for months before he was a member of it."

These extracts are sufficient to prove the folly and worthlessness of the book, and the author's own words confirm it, as it appears from them, that it was commonly considered "*absurd and profane*." Moreover, his reference to *Queen Mary*, and to the adoption of the custom in the countries mentioned, show its anti-Protestant character. Its utter absurdity renders it harmless: but, nevertheless, it is purchased from the funds of the D. C. Society, placed in its Depository, advocated by the Lord Bishop, and approved by his referees. I ask these gentlemen, if they can define its utility; if not, why were the funds of the Society misapplied, in purchasing such disgusting non-sense?

It will not be irrelevant to give a brief extract from the "*TALES OF THE TOWN*, by Henry Walford Bellairs, Perpetual Curate of *St. Thomas', Stockport*," and edited by Jas. Burns. This book is likewise Tractarianising unsuspecting readers at Miramichi. It confessedly avows allegiance to the "*Tracts for the Times*," and is an uncompromising adherent to their doctrines. It enjoins "*Confessions to Priests*," "*Daily and weekly Communions*," makes "*Confirmation a Sacrament*," "*Smooths over the difficulties between the churches of England and Rome*,"—Endeavors to establish the advantages of unity with Rome, and asks, "*who can tell what evils we are suffering now, and what blessings we have forfeited for our disunion? Where are the Saints of old? Have we now living, men holy as those, who were on earth, when the church was less disunited than it now is? Where are the Miracles wrought of old? Where are the Martyrs? Whose is the fault?—'Tis the fault of both, I fear,*" that is, the English and Romish churches.

The extracts from the "*Companion to the Prayer Book*" and "*Chorister*," must surely satisfy every unprejudiced reader that the character of them justified my appeal to the D. C. Society, for their expulsion. The first book, against which all objection was urged, has since been condemned by the Bishop, thus proving the correctness of my proceeding, as to time, place and circumstance; and I now ask his Lordship, if he can reconcile his very objectionable and insulting language in the Society with these facts.

After the discussion respecting the books had terminated, the Rev. Mr. Coster was again proposed as Secretary, and requested to continue in office. I moved an amendment to the resolution, viz.: That there be two Secretaries, Clerical and Lay, and I nominated gentlemen accordingly. The proposed amendment excited a long and warm discussion, in which the Lord Bishop took a most decided part, throwing all his influence into the scale with the nomination in favor of the Rev. Mr. Coster; and manifesting a degree of intolerance, equally incompatible with his exalted office as Bishop, and in direct violation of his duty as a Chairman of the meeting. The Rev. F. Coster, in the course of the discussion, offered to *resign office*, but the Lord Bishop expressed his unwillingness upon the subject, and advised him not to submit to the opposition of a "*packed party*,"

and accordingly the then Secretary consented to remain in office if elected. Some of the opposers of my amendment argued in favour of the "*good old ways* of the Society," and expressed their disapproval of "*any innovations*." I was really in hopes that the gentleman who spoke thus, intended to anathematize the *innovations* of Tractarianism; but this hope was soon dissipated by his determination to support the motion for one Secretary, and for the Rev. Mr. Coster as that officer. I addressed the Chairman, and asked, "If it was an innovation to conform to the Laws of the Society, which stated, 'that there might be *one or more Secretaries*?'—that, if this Law was objectionable, the framers of it were in fault,—that the proceedings of the evening had proved the *good old ways* of the Society to be very *bad old ways*, inasmuch as books had been placed upon the shelves of the Depository, without the sanction of the Committee, and the Secretary had acknowledged the irregularity." (to use no harsher term,) "of his conduct, and furthermore, as those books were very exceptionable in their doctrines.

The discussion upon the amendment continued some time, as it was obvious that the Bishop and his party were a minority: but his Lordship could not conceal his feelings, which were frequently manifested in the most unguarded expressions, equally offensive to the Meeting, and derogatory to his Lordship, as a Bishop, and a Chairman. In the course of his remarks, he said, that it would be an act of injustice to remove Mr. Coster from his office as Secretary,—that he had been a zealous and faithful servant for many years—that it was poor encouragement for gentlemen to act as Secretaries if they were to be repaid with ingratitude,—and, for his part he would advise any gentleman, who might be elected, to give himself little trouble concerning the duties of his office. His Lordship made some additional remarks in the same extraordinary strain.

Reader, if the preceding expressions are not the identical words of his Lordship, they nevertheless convey the identical meaning of the very words, which he may have used. The inference from either is precisely the same. I desire to direct attention to this circumstance, as his Lordship's sentiments excited just indignation, and induced the Hon. Mr. Hazen to reply to them. The Rev. Mr. F. Coster again arose, and addressing the Chairman, said, that he would not submit any longer to such insult, and accordingly expressed his determination to resign office. Immediately afterward, Judge Parker moved "that the Secretary's resignation be accepted," which was seconded, and very generally supported.

The Lord Bishop's unjustifiable and extra-official remarks brought the Honorable Mr. Hazen upon the floor; he told his Lordship that he had acted very improperly as Chairman in making such extraordinary observations,—that the people of this Province would not submit to such dictation,—that they had a lawful right to elect whom they chose, and that they would exercise that right,—and that he was astonished to hear a Christian Bishop, and Chairman of the Society, make the avowal, that he would advise the gentleman who might be elected as Secretary to neglect the duties of his office, merely because the Rev. Mr. Coster was not continued in office. The Chairman denied the charge, saying, that Mr. Hazen had misunderstood him: but this gentleman repeated his assertions. I was standing beside Mr. Hazen, and near his Lordship, whom I distinctly told that such was the substance of his words, and such the only inference that could be deduced from them. Some few persons, apparently the advocates of Episcopal infallibility, have censured Mr. Hazen's expressions of honest indignation. But the Bishop's "*improper conduct*," and I will add, exceedingly improper conduct, elicited his very appropriate animadversion; and I believe I declare the

feeling of the majority of the Laity in this Parish when I say, that we are indebted to this Honorable gentleman for his manly resistance against Priestly domination, and his timely co-operation in asserting and defending the Rights of the Laity, as regards the discussion of questions involving a great Principle, and the elective franchise of the members of the Diocesan Church Society.

My resolution for two Secretaries was still before the Meeting. Shortly after the resignation of the late Secretary, several gentlemen proposed the Rev. Mr. Ketchum, assigning as their reason that the Reverend gentleman whom I nominated could not conveniently attend to the duties of the office, as he did not reside either in Saint John or Fredericton; and as he was not present in the room to give information upon this subject, I immediately concurred with the nomination, and the Rev. Mr. Ketchum was unanimously elected. The motion for the two Secretaries was previously withdrawn, in compliance with the wish of *all parties*, and in order that the Meeting might proceed with the election of the Executive Committee, which was accordingly done.

After several gentlemen had been proposed as members of the Executive Committee, I nominated Dr. Botsford. Mr. Daniel Scoville, and the Rev. Mr. Coster, from Gagetown, opposed the nomination, giving, as their reason, that Dr. Botsford was not eligible, in consequence of the smallness of his subscription to the funds of the Society, which requires a subscription of one pound, to qualify the member for a seat in the Executive Committee. Dr. Botsford was dissatisfied with the proceedings of the Society, and, in common with many other gentlemen, confined his subscription to a very small amount, sufficient to give him membership, and entitle him to vote at the Anniversary meeting. But, early in the evening, and before the commencement of business, he gave the Rector of the Parish one pound increased subscription, as there was no other person to whom he could give it; the gentlemen who had the subscription papers having given them to the Secretary. This rendered him perfectly eligible as a member of the Committee. I may here observe, that the laws of the Society are such, that the moment a gentleman subscribes, that moment he becomes a member, and entitled to all the privileges of the Society, in proportion to the amount paid. It soon became apparent that the opposition arose from personal feelings with some, and from a misconception of the subject with others; and although Dr. Botsford, when the objections were first made, expressed his readiness to decline, I still maintained my nomination, as it now became a question of right *versus* party feeling, influencing many of the oppositionists. The question excited much warmth of discussion; the oppositionists denying the eligibility of Dr. Botsford. I submitted the question to the Chairman, requesting him to decide, whether Dr. Botsford was, or was not, a subscriber, under existing circumstances, and to inform the meeting how long a time must elapse between the payment of the subscription, and the eligibility of the subscriber, as the laws had not defined it. The Lord Bishop replied that such subscriptions were frequently made, and that he considered Dr. Botsford eligible. The money was then paid by the Rev. Dr. Gray to the Secretary of the Society; and after some further discussion, the question was taken, and the respective parties took opposite sides of the room. His Lordship was asked to give his opinion as to the majority, and he gave it in favour of the "Nays." This was immediately disputed, as it was obvious that the "Ayes" had a decided majority, whereupon the names were taken, and it was found that the "Ayes" amounted to 64, and the "Nays" to 42.

In the course of the election of Executive members, a Rev. gentleman, who had nominated a friend, and who thought that he might

not have been included in the list taken by the Secretary, in consequence of the confusion at the time, respectfully requested his Lordship as Chairman, to read the list before it was submitted to the voice of the Society, as he held it in his hand for this purpose. His Lordship forgetting that it was his duty to read the list of members proposed, without being called upon, petulently observed, "*How suspicious you are; do you think I intend to cheat you?*" He then read two or three names, threw the paper on the table, and desired the Secretary to read it. The list of Executive members was then submitted and adopted.

The Chief Justice now proposed an adjournment. His Lordship answered him laconically, and said he believed there was nothing more before the Society; and asking if there was any further business, and being answered in the negative, he said, "I adjourn the meeting." I was near the Chief Justice and his Lordship at the time, and distinctly heard the adjournment. Immediately after this declaration, some gentleman called out and requested the Chief Justice to take the chair, as I am informed, which was done, and a vote of "Thanks to the Lord Bishop" was proposed and carried. This vote, I assert, was not made until *after* the Meeting; and therefore it was not a vote of the Anniversary Diocesan Society. I mention this, because I should have felt myself called upon to oppose the motion, if it had been made before the adjournment, in consequence of the conduct and expressions of the Lord Bishop, which I have already noticed. As soon as the Chairman adjourned the meeting, I left the room.

The result of this meeting must have convinced the Lord Bishop of Fredericton, that the majority of the Laity in this city, are opposed to Tractarian principles. Dr. Botsford was proposed as a member of the Executive Committee, to obtain his services, and at the same time to test the opinion of the majority; for, although his Lordship stated that we were a "*packed party*," I think there would be no difficulty in proving that the "*packed party*" pre-occupied the platform, inasmuch as many of the gentlemen accompanied his Lordship from Fredericton, took precedence in the addresses, and were supplied beforehand, by his Lordship, with some "*packed*" resolutions, the last of which was unpacked by an overwhelming majority of the members present, as it manifested the pre-determination of the Bishop to have his own way in the election of officers.

The Lord Bishop of the Diocese, in both of his letters, to which I have already alluded, states "that he had *withdrawn his approval* from the 'Companion to the Prayer Book,' and that it should not "be re-imported;" Again, "as I have *withdrawn my approbation*, on grounds deemed sufficient by me, I am at a loss to know why "you urge the same objections. The book is withdrawn. Cud it "questio. His Lordship's phraseology suggests some important questions. If approval is *withdrawn*, it implies that approval pre-existed; otherwise it could not have been withdrawn. His Lordship has not assigned "the grounds deemed sufficient by himself." He sanctioned the importation of the book; and his own language authorises the conclusion, that he *once* approved of it. If the book was worthy of importation, it was surely worthy of a place in the Depository, and of protection from the Bishop who approved of it. Why then has it been withdrawn? Surely not to gratify a "*factious*" and "*packed party*." If the book contained nothing hostile to the doctrines of the Church of England, and was *ever* worthy of approval, it was his Lordship's duty to protect it with *continued* approbation, and to defend it from "*unfounded objections*." But if, on the other hand, the doctrines contained in the book are adverse to Protestantism, "*approval*" continued, or "*withdrawn*," is out of the



question. Its exclusion from the Depository should be based upon unequivocal condemnation. The "*grounds*" of *objectionable doctrines*, would be "*deemed sufficient*," not only by his Lordship, but by the Laity. I ask his Lordship, why he did not, in common candour, accompany the expression of his disapproval, with the *causes* of it? Whatever may be his sentiments upon the subject, I assert that, in justice to the Laity throughout the Province, he ought to have given these "*grounds*." His Lordship's *mode of expression* has embarrassed the interpretation of it, and surrounded his disapproval with ambiguity. The question involves a principle. If the book is doctrinally objectionable, it should be *unequivocally* condemned. If it is doctrinally correct, it should be unequivocally defended. Principle should preponderate in the scale against "*factions*," "*packed parties*," and *expedience*.

It was stated by a gentleman in the late meeting of the Diocesan Church Society, that he foresaw, that the questions which have divided the Episcopal Church in England, would, sooner or later, divide the Church in this Province; and he regretted that the subject had been brought before the meeting of the Society to disturb its peace and harmony. I duly appreciate the gentleman's love of peace, irrespective of its bearing upon the great question at issue. Tractarianism, under the baneful patronage of the sophistical Bishop of Exeter, the wily advocate of its tortuous and "*fond novelties*," is still distracting the Church of England, and most especially within his own Diocese, where, in the language of a Reviewer of his recent acts of tyranny and persecution, "*He stands at this moment in an aspect of portentous and disgusting antipathy to the true interests of the Church*;" and, "*in a recent scene of Episcopal Judicature in Plymouth, giving to Dr. Pusey and his Sciolists, the advantage of escape, by a premature and ex parte vindication, and lending the remnant of his sexagenarian respectability—if indeed a shred of it does remain, to bolster up a system of delusion, which, in his earlier days, he would have scorned.*" As for instance, an institution of the "*Orphan's Home*," at Morice Town, in Plymouth, patronized by the Queen Dowager, until it was corrupted by the Bishop of Exeter, and placed "*under the management of the SISTERS OF MERCY, imported by his Lordship from some untold whereabouts, and visited by Dr. Pusey, whom the Lady Superior and her sisters designate Father, and in whose name or writings,*" this Bishop of Exeter "*publicly declares, there was nothing but what any one might be proud of.*" Tractarianism has done and is still doing its work in England, and it is to be hoped that the general indignation which it has excited throughout the Laity, and which is now assuming a very determined character, will induce the competent powers to arrest its further progress within the pale of our Church. This schism, as I have already stated, has reached our Province, and has manifested itself not only in characteristic symbols, but in the circulation of books unequivocally Tractarian, imported in direct violation of the laws of the Diocesan Church Society, and sold from its Depositories. The temporary disturbance of the peace and harmony of the Institution is of little consequence, compared with the unresisted spread of Tractarianism; and if the Laity of New Brunswick were fully aware of the mischief which it has created elsewhere, and which it will create in this Province, if its progress is not opposed, they would rise, with an overwhelming majority, and check it. If it should become requisite, parallels of Tractarianism in England and New Brunswick can be easily drawn, showing identity of principle and similarity of practices, in the lengthened line of the former, and the shorter line of the latter.

I have authority for stating, that a number of affluent and influen-

tial gentlemen in this city, and other parts of the Province, have expressed their full determination to withdraw their aid from the Diocesan Church Society, in consequence of its importation of Tractarian books; and to establish a Fund, for the assistance of those Clergymen who are opposed to Tractarianism.

As the Reverend Mr. Coster has commenced this public discussion, and may possibly reply to this Statement of Facts, he must allow me the privilege of a Rejoinder. I beg leave, however, most explicitly, to disclaim all personal feelings in the controversy. If the principles of the Episcopal Church of England are worth the amount annually paid for the propagation of them, they are surely worth inquiry and defence, when there is reason to believe they have been assailed *within its pale*. Such has been the case in England; and such, it must be confessed, is the case in New Brunswick, if any inference is deducible, relative to doctrine, from the objectionable Works already quoted, and from the Lord Bishop's *disapproval* of the "Companion to the Prayer Book." The question is a general one, interesting equally to the Clergy and Laity.

I may here briefly state, that I have confined my remarks, in the preceding Statement, exclusively to *innovations within the pale* of the Episcopal Church of England, and introduced in direct violation of the Laws of the Diocesan Church Society.

In conclusion, I may observe, that I have submitted this Statement, relative to the proceedings of the Anniversary Meeting of the Diocesan Church Society, to several Lay Members, who were present at it, and they confirmed the correctness of the Facts. I made a memorandum of the occurrences immediately after the meeting. It is possible, however, that there may be a slight difference, as to the *order of time*, in some of the proceedings.

## 1875.

[As supplying the connecting link between the similar movements of 1849 and 1875 we reprint the following letter of a "Parishioner," addressed to the Congregation of Trinity Church, of this city, a few weeks ago.]

### *To the Pew-holders of Trinity Church.*

Among the books in our Sunday School Teacher's Library is one called "The Church Teacher's Manual," from which the following questions and answers are taken, treating of the Lord's Supper:—

Page 308 (16). "If then the Holy Eucharist be a commemoration of the Lord's death, as the Jewish Sacrifices were prefigurements of the same death, is it a Sacrifice?"

*Answer:* "The Church of Christ has always held it to be a Sacrifice."

(17). "What reasons from Scripture has she for so doing?"

*Answer:* "First of all the Jewish Prophets in foretelling the pure worship of the times of Christ, always apply to it language of a Sacrificial nature."

(19). "Show how this applies to Christian worship?"

*Answer:* "Christ never purified the literal sons of Levi to offer legal sacrifices; but when He came, He ordained a Ministry which, from the first, has celebrated a service which the Church has always held to be sacrificial."

(21). "Is this sacrificial language adopted by our Lord and His Apostles?"

*Answer:* "Yes; Our Blessed Saviour supposes that His followers will bring their gifts to the Altar (Matt. V, 23); and St. Paul says

that "we have an altar whereof they have no right to eat who serve the tabernacle."

(24). "What do these places taken together show?"

*Answer:* "They show that we are bound to understand the words, "Do this in remembrance of me," as teaching that in them Our Lord ordained a public sacrificial memorial, or a representation of His death before God."

(34). "If He is a Priest must he not have somewhat to offer?"

*Answer:* "Yes; and so he offers Himself in that body which is yet marked with the wounds He received (the Lamb as it had been slain, Rev. V. 6); and in offering Himself, He offers his Church of which he is the head."

(35). "Can the sacrificial memorial in the Eucharist be disjoined from this presentation of Himself by Our Lord?"

*Answer:* "No; on the contrary it is inseparably joined with it."

Page 328 (42). "Does God fulfil to us these promises in Holy Communion?"

*Answer:* "Yes; Our Lord offers to us His Flesh and Blood only in Holy Communion."

(48). "What means did Our Lord ordain in order that we may receive His Body and His Blood?"

*Answer:* "The Holy Communion."

(49). "Is this the only means?"

*Answer:* "It is the only means mentioned in the Scriptures."

(71). "What must we receive from the second Adam?"

*Answer:* "We must receive life through partaking of His Flesh and Blood."

(76). "But cannot we eat this bread by merely reading His word?"

*Answer:* "Christ says 'The bread I will give is My flesh,' and He has given to us in this Sacrament, the means of eating His flesh."

Page 334 (22). "But is it not enough to believe in Christ as our atonement, or our righteousness?"

*Answer:* "No; Christ especially offers Himself to us in this Sacrament as our "Living Bread," and we must come particularly believing in this if we would receive Him as our Living Bread."

Page 321 (22). "Is the Presence a Presence only in the heart of the receiver?"

*Answer:* "No; the body and blood of Christ are 'given,' as well as 'taken and eaten' (as our article says) all which things are done that the Presence of Christ may *ultimately* be in the faithful receiver."

(29). "How are we sure of this?"

*Answer:* "Because our Lord promises certain extraordinary benefits to those who eat His flesh and drink His blood; and in the Holy Eucharist alone does He offer to us His body and His blood."

Page 153 (29). "Are there any outward means for making over to the penitent sinner, after Baptism, the merits of Christ's death?"

*Answer:* "There are two: Absolution and Holy Communion."

We conclude: 1st. That the idea of Sacrifice is correct according to the "Manual." After quoting from Bishops Hall, Baxter, Dollinger, it closes with a quotation from "Garden of the Soul."

2nd. The presence is a real presence.

3rd. It is an imparted presence.

4th. The Eucharist is a specific source of life.

5th. It confers remission of sins.

6th. It is the *only* means of eating the flesh and body of Christ.

It is unnecessary to quote the passages bearing upon Absolution and Baptism.

The teaching is at variance with that of former times and a sad contrast to what is believed to be the truth by more than one

PARISHIONER.



e  
r  
f  
t  
i  
l